

Studies in Medieval History and Culture

CHURCH, SOCIETY AND UNIVERSITY

THE PARIS CONDEMNATION OF 1241/4

Deborah Grice



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Church, Society and University

In 1241/4 the theology masters at the university at Paris with their chancellor, Odo of Chateauroux, mandated by their bishop, William of Auvergne, met to condemn ten propositions against theological truth. This book represents the first comprehensive examination of what hitherto has been a largely ignored instrument in a crucial period of the university's early maturation. However, the book's ambition goes wider than this. The condemnation provides a window through which to view the wider doctrinal, intellectual, institutional and historical developments within the emerging university. These include the advent of the Dominicans and Franciscans at the university; and the developing focus of Paris theologians on using their learning for preaching at a time of rapid and sometimes divergent development of doctrine and concerns over the newly translated Aristotelian and associated Arab and Jewish works, heresy, the Greek Church and the Jews.

The book compares the condemnation's ten articles with the major statement of Catholic principles in the first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, and assesses what conclusions can be drawn from their apparent correlation.

Its examination of the condemnation in the context of the surrounding wider developments provides the basis for a much better understanding of the university and its theology faculty in the formative years between the grant of its statutes in 1215 and the better known period from the 1250s onwards, which included major figures such as Thomas Aquinas; and this, in turn, should lead to a better understanding of the later period itself and its doctrinal and institutional developments.

After an initial degree in classics at Oxford University, **Deborah Grice** had a career in the UK Home Civil Service. She then pursued an MA at King's College London in Late Antique and Byzantine Studies and a doctorate in medieval history at Oxford University – a gradual progression forward through history. Since completing her PhD in 2017 she has continued her research in the field of medieval history, in particular forbidden ideas and academic heresy, including presenting papers at international conferences and participating in workshops.

Studies in Medieval History and Culture

Recent titles include

The Charisma of Distant Places

Travel and Religion in the Early Middle Ages

Courtney Luckhardt

The Death Penalty in Late-Medieval Catalonia

Evidence and Signification

Flocel Sabaté

Church, Society and University

The Paris Condemnation of 1241/4

Deborah Grice

The Sense of Smell in the Middle Ages

A Source of Certainty

Katelynn Robinson

Travel, Pilgrimage and Social Interaction from Antiquity to the Middle Ages

Edited by Jenni Kuuliala and Jussi Rantala

Church, Society and University

The Paris Condemnation of 1241/4

Deborah Grice

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Deborah Grice

The right of Deborah Grice to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Grice, Deborah, 1950- author.

Title: Church, society and university: the Paris Condemnation of 1241/4 / Deborah Grice.

Description: Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2020. |

Series: Studies in medieval history and culture | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "In 1241/4 the theology masters at the university at Paris with their

chancellor, Odo of Chateauroux, mandated by their bishop, William of Auvergne, met to condemn ten propositions against theological truth. This book represents the first comprehensive examination of what hitherto has been a largely ignored instrument in a crucial period of the university's early maturation. However, the book's ambition goes wider than this. The condemnation provides a window through which to view the wider doctrinal, intellectual, institutional and historical developments within the emerging university. These include the advent of the Dominicans and Franciscans at the university; and the developing focus of Paris theologians on using their learning for preaching at a time of a rapid and sometimes divergent development of doctrine and concerns over the newly-translated Aristotelian and associated Arab and Jewish works, heresy, the Greek Church and the Jews. The book compares the condemnation's ten articles with the major statement of Catholic principles in the first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, and assesses what conclusions can be drawn from their apparent correlation"—Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019016907 (print) | LCCN 2019981111 (ebook) |

ISBN 9780367194383 (hardback) | ISBN 9780429202360 (ebk.)

Subjects: LCSH: Catholic Church—Doctrines—History. | Université de Paris—History—To 1500. | Lateran Council (4th: 1215: Palazzo Lateranense) | Theology, Doctrinal—History—Middle Ages, 600-1500. | Theology—Study and teaching—France—Paris—History—To 1500. | Theology—Study and teaching—Catholic Church—History—To 1500.

Classification: LCC BT50 .G65 2020 (print) | LCC BT50 (ebook) | DDC 230/.209022—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019016907>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019981111>

ISBN: 978-0-367-19438-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-20236-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman

by Deanta Global Publishing Services Chennai, India

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 The condemnation	20
2 The ten articles	33
3 Causes and influences	46
4 Evaluation of influences	132
Conclusion	195
<i>Appendix A(i): Annotated condemnation text and English translation</i>	203
<i>Appendix A(ii): Manuscripts containing the articles</i>	207
<i>Appendix B: Problematic thirteenth-century texts</i>	209
<i>Appendix C: Biographical notes</i>	227
<i>Appendix D: Lateran IV statement of faith 1215</i>	232
<i>Appendix E: Angels, Lateran IV and the condemnation</i>	238
<i>Bibliography</i>	250
<i>Index</i>	255

Preface

My interest in the 1241/4 condemnation of ten propositions against theological truth at the university at Paris originated from my study of Byzantine history for my master's degree. There I encountered the beginning of the disagreement between the Greek and Latin Churches over the procession of the Holy Spirit in the ninth century, becoming increasingly cemented as firm dogma on both sides from then on. So why did theologians at Paris need to be corrected over, or at least reminded of, such an established position in a condemnation at the theology faculty at Paris in the 1240s, after the fall of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204 and with Latin doctrine now clearly ascendant? This question led me to the study of the 1241/4 condemnation as a whole for my doctorate, with the dual procession just one of the numerous enigmas revealed in it. And that led in turn to the whole context for the condemnation, and its significance for our understanding of the development of the university at Paris and those studying within it. My research has only scratched the surface of this significant but largely neglected instrument, but I hope it may inspire deeper excavation in the future.

My thanks are owed to many people, on both the academic and domestic side. I will, therefore, single out only a few. First and foremost must be my doctorate supervisor, Matthew Kempshall, who helped and encouraged me throughout that process. His eye for detail was enviable, and his deep and encyclopaedic knowledge formidable. I am also grateful to Cecilia Trifogli for her invaluable help in explaining the mysteries of medieval arguments on the first moment of time; to Brenda Bolton for sharing with me some research she had done on Gregory IX, especially in the period before he became pope; to Görgе Hasselhoff for help on the chronology of Latin translations of the Talmud and of Maimonides; and to Cornelia Linde for introducing me to the complexities of medieval education for my master's degree, and subsequently for her advice on the Dominican 'scholia'. In addition, I have benefitted greatly from involvement in Lydia Schumacher's project on Alexander of Hales' *Summa theologiae*, and Ann Giletti's work on heresy, together with the scholars I met through their research.

Second, my family have been a constant support. In particular, my husband, Joe, put up with nearly four years of a preoccupied and often absent wife during my doctorate. And my three adult children have been my continuing, and patient, advisers on the mysteries of IT, even at long distance, with one now resident in the USA. I have trespassed on both their expertise and their hospitality, and my thanks go out to all three and their families.

Acknowledgements

Frontispiece: manuscript of 1241/4 condemnation:

New College Library, Oxford, MS 109, f.1r © Courtesy of the Warden and Scholars of New College, Oxford.

Appendix D: Lateran IV Statement of Faith 1215:

© N. Tanner, 1990, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Sheed and Ward, used by permission of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc., vol. 1, pp. 230–3.

Abbreviations

- ACG: *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. B.M. Reichert (9 vols., Rome, 1898–1904).
- ACP: *Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum. Première province de Provence, province Romaine, province d’Espagne*, 1239–1302, ed. M.J.C. Douais (Toulouse, 1894–95).
- AFH: *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (Rome, 1908–).
- AFP: *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Rome, 1931–).
- AHR: *American Historical Review*.
- Alexander, Glossa: Magistri Alexandri de Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1951–7).
- Alexander, Quaestiones: Magistri Alexandri de Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae ‘antequam esset frater’*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1960).
- Alexander, Quaestiones universitatem: Alexandri de Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent*, ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome, 2013).
- Alexander, Summa: Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Ordinis minorum, *Summa theologica*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1924–48).
- ‘Appendix B’: Trizio, M., Gutas, D., Burnett, C., Demetracopoulos, J.A. and Zonta, M., ‘Appendix B – Medieval Translations’, in R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, revised 2014), ii, pp. 792–832.
- Aquinas, Summa: Sancti Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici (de Aquino), *Summa Theologica*, in *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita*, cura et studio Fratrum Praedicatorum (50 vols., Rome, 1882–), iv–xii.
- ‘Aristoteles Latinus’: Dod, B.G., ‘Aristoteles Latinus’, in N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny and J. Pinborg (eds.), *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 43–79.
- Auvray: *Les registres de Grégoire IX, recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées et analysées d’après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican*, ed. L. Auvray (4 vols., Paris, 1896).

- Barnes: *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984).
- BF: *Bullarium Franciscanum Romanorum Pontificum constitutiones ...*, eds. J.S. Sbaraleae and K. Eubel (7 vols., Rome, 1759–1904).
- BMGS: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*.
- Borgnet: B. Alberti Magni, *Opera omnia ...*, ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).
- Cambridge Maimonides Companion: K. Seeskin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Cambridge Medieval Philosophy: R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, revised 2014).
- CCCM: *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*.
- CHR: *The Catholic Historical Review*.
- CUP: *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Ecumenical Councils: *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London and Washington, 1990).
- EHR: *English Historical Review*.
- Eriugena, Periphyseon: Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae, *Periphyseon (De divisione naturae)*, books I–II, ed. I.P. Sheldon-Williams (Dublin, 1968, 1972); book III, eds. I.P. Sheldon-Williams and L. Bieler (Dublin, 1981); book IV, ed. E.A. Jeaneau (Dublin, 2009); book V, ed. E.A. Jeaneau (Turnholt, 2003).
- JEH: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*.
- JJS: *Journal of Jewish Studies*.
- JMH: *Journal of Medieval History*.
- JML: *Journal of Medieval Latin*.
- JMRS: *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*.
- JQR: *Jewish Quarterly Review*.
- JSQ: *Jewish Studies Quarterly*.
- JTS: *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- Lombard, Sentences: Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano (4 vols., Toronto, 2007–10).
- Lombard, Sententiae: Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1971–81).
- Mansi: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio ...*, eds. G.D. Mansi et al. (53 vols., Paris, 1758–1927).
- MPT: *Medieval Philosophy and Theology*.
- MS: *Mediaeval Studies*.
- PL: *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (221 vols., Paris, 1844–64).
- RSPT: *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*.
- RTAM: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*.
- William of Auvergne, Opera omnia: Guilielmi Alverni, *Opera omnia ...* (2 vols., Paris, 1674).

Introduction

‘First cast the beam from thine own eye before seeing clearly to remove the mote from thy brother’s’¹

In 1241/4 the regent masters in theology at the university at Paris gathered together under their chancellor, Odo of Châteauroux, mandated by their bishop, William of Auvergne, to condemn ten propositions against theological truth and affirm the true doctrine.² This was a significant event in itself, and was seen as such by its contemporaries. It was notable institutionally, intellectually, doctrinally and politically.

The condemnation forms the focus for this book. However, its study is a means to a more ambitious end. The intellectual, and indeed institutional, history of the period leading up to and around the condemnation has been relatively neglected, in comparison with the preceding twelfth century, with its so-called ‘renaissance’, and the subsequent second half of the thirteenth century, with its dominant figures, such as Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure. But the years between 1215 and 1250 were important in their own right, and not merely as the transition between the two. While there are some studies covering this period, analysis of the 1241/4 condemnation provides the opportunity to flesh out and refine the emerging picture further and gain important new insights into the theology faculty at the university and the role and aspirations of its members at a critical point in its development. The condemnation offers a window through which to look at the period with new eyes. The preceding period was one of rapid change for Paris theologians, and the years 1241–1244 themselves saw major upheaval, uncertainty and opportunity. Modern scholars have paid relatively little attention to the condemnation itself, and even less to its historical context and importance.³ This book aims to address this gap.

Institutional and intellectual context

To understand the significance of the condemnation and its contribution to our understanding of the history of the period, it is important from the outset to put it in its institutional and intellectual context. The condemnation took place in a turbulent period politically, and at an early period in the development of a university

2 Introduction

at Paris. The disparate twelfth-century Parisian schools had enjoyed differing legal status and fell under different academic disciplines, some with self-appointed charismatic teachers or masters, some connected with institutions. Students were largely free to manage their studies as they wished and the masters could choose what to teach and the texts to follow, although informal lists existed.⁴ These schools attracted students from across Europe with their illustrious teachers, such as Peter Abelard; however, they gradually developed into a more corporate but equally prestigious body in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, with statutes granted to the emerging organisation in 1215.⁵

However, the statutes were only part of a process of the embryonic university's institutional formulation and refinement both before 1215 and subsequently – involving its successful struggle for rights, including corporate status, protection from the French monarchy, the right to treat in the papal court, and limitations on the chancellor's powers over the conferral of licences to teach. Such achievements, led by the masters, must have increased their belief in their collective power. This was accompanied by an increasing coherence within the university as a whole. A decision by both masters and students to go on strike in 1229 in response to the deaths of several students at the hands of civic guardsmen following a riot in the city, albeit with the exception of the mendicants there, demonstrates this growing institutional self-confidence. Pope Gregory IX supported the university, ensuring the strike's successful conclusion in 1231, with a papal bull, *Parens scientiarum*, providing additional securities for the university – and this would again have added to the masters' conviction in their own importance and that of their organisation.

The development of discrete faculties at the university at Paris formed a piece of this overall picture. Contemporary documents for the early period are inconclusive on the relationship between the faculties and the university – indeed the term 'facultas' to mean a body, not merely an academic discipline, only became standard in the middle of the thirteenth century, although it is clear that the groupings later regularised as faculties existed much earlier, with masters in the different disciplines comprising specific groups.⁶ The arts faculty was established as a legal corporation by the middle of the thirteenth century, while the three higher faculties of theology, canon law and medicine remained without formal status until the second half of the century. However, while, as the largest faculty and the first to acquire legal status, the rector of the faculty of arts increasingly took on the role of head of the university, it remained the junior discipline. Indeed, it appears that the theology masters kept a careful eye on developments there from before they acquired their formal legal status, and first the pope and later the theology masters, with the bishop of Paris, acted to restrain its activities. It was as part of this development that the study of philosophy per se, based in the emerging arts faculty, became subordinated in status to that of theology, and implicitly increasingly under the oversight gradually being assumed by the theology masters.⁷ This may, perhaps, have been because, with the exception of the mendicants, all the theology masters had graduated through the arts faculty – the texts both studied and produced there formed the

foundation for their later studies and thus gave them a vested interest in the contents of its syllabus.⁸

It is as part of this gradual and incremental development of a university at Paris that the 1241/4 condemnation should be viewed. It represented a further step in the theology faculty's institutionalisation and increasingly collective approach. Moreover, as this book will argue, it may be the first example of the theology faculty exerting control over that of the arts, if in fact its provisions covered members of both. If so, it further demonstrates the increasing dominance and self-confidence of the theology faculty at Paris.

The condemnation should also be seen, in respect of both content and process, in its intellectual context, in particular that of other proceedings dealing with problematic teaching or that perceived as heretical. This was particularly in the aftermath of the university statutes of 1215 and of Lateran IV, the major ecumenical church council under Pope Innocent III, whose political and ecclesiastical rulings dominated church affairs for centuries to come – albeit the condemnation of the views of individuals or groups was well-established practice from the time of Augustine onwards. Critically, in respect of whether a teaching was theologically acceptable, the first canon of Lateran IV defined proper Catholic doctrine, against which all aberrant belief and heresy should be judged – while some specific beliefs were singled out, the process was one of exclusion of all views not in tune with proper doctrine, rather than offering an exclusive list.⁹ The line between heresy and error was not specified, but error maintained once its perpetrator was corrected risked severe sanctions, including excommunication. Lateran IV was the first major restatement of the principles of the Christian creed since the great ecumenical councils of the fourth century, and its requirements were the theological blue-print for centuries to come – and perhaps, as this book will argue, the inspiration, for the condemnation. But they represented broad principles. The following decades saw the working out of an emerging, detailed orthodoxy, and the condemnation can be seen as a manifestation of this process.

The relationship of problematic teaching with heresy needs a brief examination here. There has been much recent discussion of the term 'academic heresy', a classification under which the 1241/4 condemnation can be said to fall – while the condemnation is not couched in terms of heresy, and those contravening its dictates were not labelled as heretics, it articulates certain ideas as forbidden and decrees that those maintaining them will be subject to excommunication.¹⁰ This brings it firmly within the purview of academic heresy.

The use of the terms 'heresy' and 'heretics' by, or in respect of, theologians writing theological works in an institutional context, in particular an academic context, in the first half of the thirteenth century, is complex.¹¹ This is in respect of debate on theological issues by what one could term 'professional theologians' within an institutional framework – whether the church itself or an academic setting – with the ideas usually formulated, or anyway discussed, within such a setting. Such debate was afforded considerable latitude. Discussions could take place without the person putting forward the dubious theories being necessarily identified with them.¹² Such ideas and discussions would involve complex concepts.¹³

4 Introduction

It thus sits largely outside what is today popularly viewed as heresy in this period, in particular dualism and the texts associated with it, with their connection with the beginnings of the inquisition and its hard-line approach.

However, this is not to say the two areas can be separated entirely – many theologians in the church or at the university were troubled by the same issues, in particular the existence of evil, that underlay dualism, and ideas related to dualism therefore appear in reputable theological texts in this period. But this was usually as complex issues for internal, carefully nuanced or even disguised, debate, outside the popular context – even though several of the theologians concerned were, or would go on also to be, actively involved in combatting it in the world outside.

But that point itself needs qualification – for example, William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, devoted considerable effort specifically to refuting the populist version of dualism in his major theological treatise, aimed directly at the arguments of its proponents outside the academic context, albeit using complex argumentation; and many other theologians openly attacked those they sometimes called ‘Cathars’, the name normally used today (or ‘Manichees’, as they usually called them) in their academic works. Moreover, many earlier heresies, such as Arianism, which became populist and divided the church, were started by learned churchmen.

However, as a general rule, heresies in the institutional context tended to be viewed and treated differently. Indeed, at the mildest end, they could merit purely internal, non-punitive fraternal correction rather than a coercive judicial process. But, at the other, more severe, end, even if not formally described as heresies, sanctions against those at places of learning offending against the doctrines set out in the various censures and condemnations issued and refusing to change their views often, as in the 1241/4 condemnation, included excommunication, and all those excommunicated could be deemed heretics – as Pope Gregory’s *Decretals* from the 1230s stated, ‘Excommunicati sunt omnes haeretici, quibuscunque nominibus nominentur’ (‘the excommunicated are all heretics, by whatever names they go under’).¹⁴

An example demonstrating the symbiotic nature of popular and institutional heresy comes in the introduction to one of the manuscripts of the 1241/4 condemnation: in referring to the penalty of excommunication for contravening article one, this states:

Hunc errorem reprobamus **et assertores et defensores** auctoritate Wilhermi episcopi excommunicamus ...¹⁵

The inclusion of ‘defensores’ (‘defenders’) in addition to ‘assertores’ (‘assertors’) was becoming increasingly commonplace in statutes against ‘full-blooded’ heretics, for example one issued at a council at Toulouse in 1229. It was one of the eleven categories of those classified as, or associated with, heresy in a council at Tarragona in 1249, defined as those who have knowingly defended heretics by word or action or hindered the church in pursuing heresy, whether in their own lands or otherwise. Its appearance in an academic ruling may not be surprising,

but the use of the same term supports a link in contemporary minds between the two extremes.¹⁶

This movement to define orthodoxy and eliminate views which did not conform to it and might thus be on the spectrum of heresy, coupled with the university's growing institutionalisation, led in turn to the increasing imposition of rules on the progression and methods of study, the curricula and the texts to be taught (and those prohibited) from 1215 onwards. Specific measures to ensure orthodoxy included both actions against individuals and wide-ranging condemnations targeted at correcting or regularising doctrine. Such condemnations sought to control the direction and detail of theological thinking at universities, including most notably Paris and Oxford, by means of lists of beliefs which were prohibited with sanctions attached.¹⁷

Turning to process, the 1241/4 condemnation was the first we know of to focus, not on a particular individual or individuals or specific works, but on a group of doctrines, probably from a range of sources and of perpetrators. This became a precedent to be followed, most notably in two later and more famous condemnations at the university at Paris in 1270 and 1277.¹⁸ The significance of this departure can easily be obscured when viewed in the light of such developments; but it is striking that all earlier censures and prohibitions were targeted at specific works or individuals and their followers, albeit sometimes with the aberrant doctrine specified, rather than primarily at the doctrines themselves. Moreover, the anonymity of any censured individuals in the 1241/4 condemnation (with one exception) was a notable departure from previous practice.¹⁹

In summary, of the specific earlier actions affecting the emerging university at Paris, the first known academic censure recorded there was within the embryonic theology faculty, against Amaury of Bène in 1205–6, probably started by some of its members prior to Amaury's unsuccessful appeal to the pope. An episcopal synod at Sens in 1210 followed – this banned all reading in public or secret of Aristotle's works on metaphysics and natural philosophy, together with retrospective action against Amaury, a ban on David of Dinant's works, and the handing-over of some theological tracts written in French to local bishops. This synod may also have banned Eriugena's *Periphyseon*, but this is disputed. Subsequently, at Rome, as well as its major statement of faith and action generally against heresy, Lateran IV condemned Joachim of Fiore's Trinitarian doctrine (and endorsed that of Peter Lombard), together with Amaury's theories, although with Amaury's teachings viewed as more mad than heretical. In the run-up to Lateran IV, Robert of Courson, papal legate, formulated the first statutes for the university at Paris – these reinforced the ban on teaching Aristotelian texts on metaphysics and natural philosophy, or summaries of them, and on the works of Amaury, David of Dinant and 'Mauricius Hispanus', although this ban appears now to have been restricted to the arts faculty.

The next significant ruling on reading and/or teaching affecting the university came in 1225, when Pope Honorius III commanded the archbishops of France to search out and burn copies of Eriugena's *Periphyseon* (mentioning, possibly erroneously, that it had been condemned earlier by the Archbishop of Sens), and

specifically and comprehensively prohibiting it for those in monasteries and elsewhere ('aliis locis') and those in cloisters or studying and too keen on new ideas. Finally, in 1231, and again relating primarily to texts and authors, Pope Gregory IX's bull, *Parens scientiarum*, reiterated for the arts faculty at Paris the 1210 ban imposed on Aristotle's natural philosophy until the books had been examined and purged, and ordered the theology masters not to appear as philosophers but keep to theological works and those of the Fathers, together with other self-restraints. This was accompanied by a letter from the pope to 'Master W.' and others, asking them to examine and expurgate the banned books on nature to exclude those texts which were erroneous, scandalous or offensive and allow study of the rest.

It is notable that, except for the initial censure of Amaury of Bène, all these condemnations were externally imposed by the pope or his legates or bishops without reference to others participating in the decisions, even if triggered by concerns voiced from within the university. This was even the case with the 1215 university statutes, imposed by Robert of Courson, although he was previously a student and briefly chancellor at Paris.

The 1241/4 condemnation thus emerges as an important step in the development of the identity of a university of teaching masters at Paris. This was both in its targeting of doctrines rather than texts or individuals (and indeed with its required beliefs, or 'truths', picking up a positive, not merely preventive, role), and in the internal nature of its imposition. This new approach fits the context that this book envisages for the condemnation. It demonstrates a new, more ambitious, attitude among Paris theology masters, working collectively and eager to assert their own authority and serve the church but who were also masters of their own affairs. They were keen to ensure and demonstrate their adherence to Catholic principles and eliminate internal views which, although perhaps tolerated previously, could now be classed as aberrant, or even quasi-heretical, as mandated by Lateran IV and according to the orthodoxy emerging from its more detailed exposition.

The early 1240s can be seen as a period of relative unity for a theology faculty keen to develop its influence and role, albeit the different affiliations and views between mendicants and seculars, as well as other divisions which emerged subsequently in the 1250s, may have been present in embryo. Moreover, if the formation of 'the university' in 1215 was itself a response to a recognised need to clarify the organisational and doctrinal complexity of a plethora of individual schools and masters, the events of the 1230s and 1240s need to be seen as part of the same process. The period from 1215 to the end of the 1240s needs to be treated as a continuum – it was a formative time, with the 1241/4 condemnation a defining moment within it.

The condemnation and the sources for its study

There is no properly edited text of the condemnation. The *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, however, contains the version commonly accepted, including the order of articles, while its footnotes specify some of the variants

found elsewhere.²⁰ A better text is desirable, but the versions are insufficiently different to prevent the condemnation's study without it – and, given the lack of the detailed analysis to be found in a modern critical edition, to use a different text would carry significant risks. This book therefore adopts the *CUP*'s ordering of the articles and its wording, with any significant deviations noted and discussed. As regards the manuscript tradition, William Courtenay cited twenty-three different manuscripts containing the list of articles, and further ones may yet be identified.²¹ The complete list is also found in contemporary accounts, in particular Matthew Paris' *Chronica majora* (at the end of his entry for 1243), Bonaventure's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* (c.1250–2), and the 1256 record of the Dominican Provincial Chapter of Provence. The condemnation is referred to in numerous texts, for example, by Roger Bacon (†1292) and Odo Rigaud (†1275), and in the records of the 1243 and 1256 Dominican General Chapters at Paris; and it is included alongside those of 1277 and others in collections of condemnations, such as the *Collectio errorum in Anglia et Parisius condempnatorum*.²²

Turning to the sources for its investigation, this book aims to understand the condemnation of 1241/4 with contemporary eyes, not with the benefit of hindsight or retrospective extrapolation.²³ The main sources used are therefore contemporary texts or those which theologians in the period would themselves have read.²⁴ These texts fall into four main groups. First, there are the writings of scholars, primarily based at Paris. Peter Lombard's comprehensive *Sententiae*, written around the middle of the twelfth century, formed an increasingly important part of the theological curriculum in the thirteenth century, becoming the standard textbook before the 1240s and providing a common structure for theological thought both at the university and within the mendicant schools. This book therefore takes as three 'control' texts, first, the *Sententiae* themselves, second, Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* on them from the 1220s and, third, Albertus Magnus' commentary on them from the 1240s.²⁵ The use of the *Sententiae* and subsequent commentaries offers the opportunity to track a chronological progression of thought during the period, which, while present in other texts, is less visible because they do not similarly share a common structure for discussion.²⁶ The texts selected also represent three groups: Peter Lombard, a secular master when he wrote his *Sententiae* and subsequently a bishop; Alexander, a secular master who became a Franciscan late in his life, after composing his *Glossa*; Albertus, a Dominican and again, albeit much later than the condemnation, a bishop.

These three selected works on the *Sententiae* are complemented by other contemporary theological works, most notably by William of Auvergne, secular and bishop of Paris from 1228, and the Dominicans Guerric of St.-Quentin (†1245) and Hugh of St.-Cher (†1263). The choice here has been influenced by their subject matter (whether they cover the issues in the condemnation) and author (whether they had a role in the condemnation or were writing in the period immediately around it). In addition, I have examined the list of questions in Douai, MS 434, both for individual questions relevant to the condemnation and for an overview of the main issues exercising theological minds in the period: with 572 entries in two volumes, dated by Palémon Glorieux mainly between 1230 and

8 *Introduction*

1235–7 and apparently originating in Paris, the list is an invaluable source for the relative weight and range of current issues in the theology faculty. 510 of them comprise actual questions ('quaestiones' from discussions between a master and his students following textual study) rather than major works of scholarship, and thus represent topics viewed as important in the 1230s, although not, perhaps, with the immediacy of the recently introduced quodlibets (unscripted questions, often topical, raised in open sessions and not set by the master answering).²⁷

The second group of texts is linked to the first. It comprises the documents that contemporary theologians at Paris themselves would have studied or been acquainted with, directly or indirectly. They include the Bible (and references to the various glosses on it cited by theologians); the works of the Church Fathers, both Latin (with Augustine heading the list from the fourth century) and Greek (notably pseudo-Dionysius, from around the late fifth/early sixth century, and John Damascene, from the late seventh/eighth, both highly respected in the Latin world); Latin authorities such as Boethius from the late fifth/early sixth century; previous Latin works, for example, by the controversial ninth-century John Scottus Eriugena, and texts by twelfth-century Latin theologians, including Gilbert of Poitiers and Alan of Lille, still read in Paris; and, a crucial group, texts available in the Latin west from the ancient Greek philosophers, especially Plato and Aristotle, some of them known from the sixth century or earlier, but the majority translated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, together with the commentaries on them by Arab and Jewish philosophers/theologians such as Avicenna (†1037), and, in the immediate run-up to the condemnation, Averroes (†1198) and Maimonides (†1204). The reception of Greek philosophical texts, starting with Boethius, and then the translators in the twelfth/thirteenth century, is critical for understanding the condemnation's context, as is the sometimes amorphous influx of Neoplatonic and Aristotelian thought they represent, which had a major influence on the development of Latin thinking.

The third group of texts comprises contemporary works, including those written by or against the Greeks, those deemed heretics, Jews, and others outside the Catholic Church. The fourth and final group includes official or quasi-official texts, such as records of councils, papal records and letters, records from the mendicant orders, accounts of debates (notably with the Greek Church, 1234, and the trial of the Talmud at Paris, 1240), records of condemnations and censures and other records related to the university at Paris and its theology faculty, its scholarship, development and role.

As regards the underlying methodology, the evidence from the primary sources needs, as ever, a cautious approach. They are written by individuals or bodies with their own perspectives, selectivity and misunderstandings, and with their own points to make. This has been much discussed in the context of inquisition records and heresy texts, but is true more generally. This book, therefore, tries to look at them in context, rather than at face value. Moreover, the amount of material is formidable, with many texts unedited. Since the book's aim is to look at trends and thereby to establish the intellectual and institutional significance of the condemnation as a whole, rather than individual attributions, the selection has

been made on that basis, with a focus where possible on edited texts. While study of unedited texts could provide specific fresh insights, for example, in identifying further texts offending against the emerging orthodoxy being mandated by the condemnation, the most important works, such as William of Auvergne's major seven-part work, the *Magisterium divinae et sapientiale*, have been edited, albeit the edition is now somewhat dated.

Finally, to avoid viewing the 1240s through later perspectives, the book concentrates on primary texts only up to c.1244, the last probable date for the condemnation. The exception is works in the years immediately following this, where they still reflect the perspectives of that period, albeit with any requisite adjustments to doctrine. However, the book does not look at the impact of the condemnation. This would be a fascinating study in itself, but impacts are often unintended and could distort contemporary assessment of the underlying issues, particularly as theologians at Paris continued to develop their understanding of the newly translated material and would have viewed the condemnation's articles in the light of their new perspectives.

As regards secondary sources, the period around the condemnation has been largely neglected. This is not to say that it has received no attention. Here the works of John Baldwin in 1970, Stephen Ferruolo in 1985, Ian Wei in 2012 and Spencer Young in 2014 are particularly notable in their analysis of the gradual development of the twelfth-century Parisian schools into a university in the thirteenth, both institutionally and in respect of intellectual thinking.²⁸ Moreover, there are few studies on the condemnation itself, although there are some helpful discussions, especially on questions of process and timing, on which this book draws. Where such studies discuss the influences behind the condemnation, the book provides a critical commentary on their conclusions. In particular, it seeks to moderate the tendency to distinguish between discrete intellectual traditions, as well as endeavouring to throw new light on the development of the university at Paris and the theology masters within it at a critical stage of its development.

An example of the caution needed in trying to reach a contemporary understanding of the condemnation comes from the question of so-called 'academic freedom', an issue connected with freedom of thought in modern eyes. As is demonstrated by the collective approaches to the pope by the masters in the late twelfth/early thirteenth century – which concerned only status, not intellectual freedom – academic freedom meant the freedom of an academic body to regulate itself (not, as now, freedom of teaching or learning).²⁹ Moreover, the vast majority of scholars would have been unwilling to transgress a doctrinal 'orthodoxy' that was being refined throughout this period. As the later Paris theologian, Godfrey of Fontaines, argued in the aftermath of the 1277 condemnation, truths required for salvation were distinct from truths that were neutral to faith: only where the truth affected matters of faith, since salvation was at stake, should they be pursued by speaking out against improper condemnation.³⁰ Regulation of doctrine formed part of the developing exercise of authority by the theology masters – together with their growing perception of their role as reformers and teachers, stemming from the criticisms of the early reformers and encapsulated in the 1215 university

statutes which gave them the right to design and enforce some of their own rules, rights enhanced in the 1231 papal bull, *Parens scientiarum*. Indeed, by demonstrating their adherence to Catholic principles, the masters' acceptance of, and participation in, the exercise of, such authority could strengthen their confidence in the importance of their collective leadership in doctrinal matters and support the emerging position of the faculty as a trusted source of learning and specialised knowledge at the highest intellectual level.

Outline of the book

To understand the significance of the 1241/4 condemnation, two separate but linked areas for investigation lie at the heart of this book: the background to each of the ten articles, why each of them caused concern in the 1240s in Paris; and why these specific ten articles were chosen, out of so many potentially contentious issues across the theological/philosophical spectrum. Study of these areas throws important light on the intellectual and institutional preoccupations of the time.

Within these two areas the book examines three specific issues. The first concerns the facts: the condemnation's date; its targets; the process and what its articles cover. Some work has already been done on this, which this book builds upon. The main focus of scholarship so far, however, has centred on its date and the number of times it was issued, with the different manuscripts variously dating it to 1241 and 1244. The second area concerns why the condemned beliefs may have been held and why these specific issues were seen as critical. There are some studies on this, but little analysis of the group's intellectual and wider historical context as a whole. Views range from seeing it as primarily or completely a refutation of Neoplatonic views among theologians, to an attempt to reject the new Aristotelian learning infiltrating the university, or a more heterogeneous collection of concerns from a range of sources.³¹ The third area concerns the condemnation's immediate and long-term effects. This book concentrates on the second area – why the beliefs were held and why tackling them was seen as crucial – with the first as essential background; the third is ground for future study. The condemnation is a portal through which to look at broader intellectual, historical and institutional contexts; it is not itself the book's only, or even the primary, objective.

As regards the book's structure, Chapters 1 and 2 provide essential material on the condemnation to allow it to function in subsequent chapters as a window on the period from 1215 to 1250. Chapter 1 discusses the 'facts' about the condemnation, as far as they are known or generally agreed, including its dating, the process and the people involved. Chapter 2 contains a summary of its articles as the basis for the following discussion. With this focus, Chapter 3 discusses the institutional, historical and doctrinal developments which could have shaped the condemnation. Chapter 4 assesses the influence of these developments against the individual articles and the condemnation as a whole – including why the condemned propositions might have been held, why these particular ten might have been chosen for censure and correction, and the connections between them. It includes summaries of passages in works from contemporary scholars which throw light on

their derivations as well as illustrating the range of issues covered. Appendix A contains the text of the condemnation in Latin, together with an English translation. It includes the main manuscript variations, as taken from the *CUP*.³² While the possible attribution of the condemned propositions to individual theologians is not the focus of the book, Appendix B sets out passages by theologians in the run-up to the condemnation which contain, or may imply, such views, from my own findings or drawn from earlier research. Brief notes on the main theologians concerned in its imposition or whose works are cited are at Appendix C. Appendix D contains the Latin text, with an English translation, of canons one and two of Lateran IV. Appendix E offers a case study looking at the parallel coverage of angels in Lateran IV and the condemnation.

The book's conclusions are three-fold. First, in respect of the institutional and doctrinal climate underlying the condemnation, no single influence dominated. The period was one of developing views for theologians in Paris, based on long-term issues arising from the Bible and discussions going back at least to Augustine but now sharpened by the 'threat' of external influences. The concern this generated should be seen against the background of a developing focus among theologians on using their learning for teaching and preaching, not merely for furthering their own reputation or intellectual fulfilment; the introduction of the mendicant orders to the university from 1217 with their wider anti-heresy and missionary role; and the positions that many of the theologians involved had (or would go on to take up) outside the university. Papal interest in the university, not just at Paris but also (from 1229) Toulouse, also forms part of this overall background.

Second, as regards the choice, order and possible grouping of articles, article one of the condemnation on the beatific vision appears to be the leading article, possibly the catalyst for its formulation, given the increasingly sensitive and controversial nature of the underlying issues. It is implicitly covered in the opening words on God's ineffable and incomprehensible nature in the 1215 statement of faith at the beginning of Lateran IV, but not articulated explicitly there. However, following this, the articles appear to follow closely the doctrine which was set out in Lateran IV, starting with the Trinity and moving to creation, including the angelic creation and fall, the beginning of the world and of good and evil, and finally mankind's fall. The content and order is too close to be coincidental – the argument that the articles are linked to the sequence in Lateran IV seems compelling.³³

This was a period where the details of orthodox belief were in the process of definition, and those deviating from the emerging consensus subject to correction and, if refusing to conform, open to the accusation of disobedient or even heretical views. Given the articles' reflection of Lateran IV's core principles, coupled with the doctrinal pressures facing theologians at the university in the 1230s and early 1240s and evidence of deviations from what was becoming the orthodox thinking on issues, such as the vision of God, in many of their works, the condemnation was clearly needed to provide an articulation of the detailed orthodox positions. The masters needed to flesh-out the principles enshrined in the statement of faith in Lateran IV for their own clear guidance within the faculty and the groups

represented there – and, thereby, to put their own house in order. Indeed, as demonstrated in Appendix B, almost all the necessarily selective list of respected and influential theologians whose works are cited in this study had to refine or change at least some of their views in the light of the condemnation, evidence perhaps that the need for such articulation was pressing. But, as the book's third and major conclusion, this was not merely driven by internal self-discipline. 1241/4 was the point at which the faculty of theology itself 'came of age' and embraced responsibility for its own affairs: it aspired to leadership in the formulation and development of Catholic doctrine according to the principles laid down in Lateran IV; and it saw its role as external, guiding the faithful, combatting heresy and converting unbelievers, as well as internal excellence in learning. It was to achieve this wider role that it needed 'to cast the beam from its own eye before seeing clearly to remove the mote from its brother's'.³⁴

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 Mt. vii:3–5.
- 2 *CUP*, i, no. 128, pp. 170–2. For the condemnation's date, see below, pp. 20–3.
- 3 For example, F.-X. Putallaz, 'Censorship', in *Cambridge Medieval Philosophy*, i, pp. 99–113, does not mention the 1241/4 condemnation. The lack of attention by most scholars may, perhaps, be partly because it has generally been seen as a miscellany of disjointed provisions with no obvious allure to attract scholars – such as the condemnation of major individuals or works found in earlier proscriptions, or the magnitude and clear significance of the later 1277 condemnation of 219 or 220 propositions in Paris.
- 4 For discussion of the nature of the twelfth-century Parisian schools, the early years at the university at Paris and the implications of institutionalisation in terms of the transition to a community of masters, collective decision-making, compulsory rules and statutes, and uniformity in ways of teaching, see J. Verger, 'The First French Universities and the Institutionalization of Learning', in J. Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 5–19. See also W.J. Courtenay, 'The Institutionalism of Theology', in Van Engen (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 247–9; S.C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University* (Stanford, California, 1985), *passim*; I.P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 88–9; G. Post, 'Parisian Masters as a Corporation, 1200–1246', *Speculum*, 9 (1934), pp. 430–43. This evolution was attributable at least in part to an emerging professional identity based on common values and consciousness of responsibilities. S.E. Young, 'Queen of Faculties' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ph.D. thesis, 2009), pp. 42–59, argues that, as well as corporate unity, a standardised curriculum and internal discipline were key to creating the theology faculty's reputation and helped the masters to establish themselves 'as definitive arbiters of Christian orthodoxy' (see also S.E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 57–8). A letter from Pope Innocent III to the bishop of Paris in 1207 (*CUP*, i, no. 5, p. 65) restricting the number of theology masters in Paris to eight can be seen as an early step in the institutionalisation of theology in Paris generally and the emerging university.
- 5 The 1215 statutes were a landmark – although mainly regularising the status quo, for the first time they defined the masters' powers and limitations statutorily, with more independence from the chancellor and bishop (G. Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (New York, 1968), pp. 25–7).

- 6 For the use of the term 'faculty', see O. Weijers, *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 1987), pp. 52–5. For the first clear use, in 1253, of 'facultas' to mean university faculty, see *CUP*, i, no. 219, pp. 242–4. For earlier evidence of masters being treated as specific groups from 1235, see, for example, *CUP*, i, no. 108, pp. 157–8.
- 7 Verger, 'First French Universities', pp. 11–3; M.J. Jordan, '*Philosophica disciplina*: Learning to Teach Philosophy in a University', in J. Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), p. 113.
- 8 Young, *Scholarly Community*, pp. 20–32; Wei, *Intellectual Culture*, pp. 110–4.
- 9 L.J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011), pp. 90–3. This book uses the terms 'Catholic' and 'Latin' interchangeably, depending on context, with 'Latin' generally used when contrasted with the Greek Church or its doctrine.
- 10 For academic heresy generally, see L.E. Bosworth, 'Perceptions of the Origins and Causes of Heresy in Medieval Heresiology' (University of Edinburgh, Ph.D. thesis, 1995); J.C. Eby, 'The Petrification of Heresy' (University of Washington, Ph.D. thesis, 1998). For definitions of heresy, see O.E. Kim, 'Canon Three of the Fourth Lateran Council' (University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 2007).
- 11 The 1240's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* by the Dominican, Albertus Magnus, may exemplify contemporary use of the terms heresy, sin, and error. Albertus usually seems to refer to doctrines as heresies, rather than the perpetrators as heretics, although, for example, he cites Augustine referring to 'Novi haeretici Pelagiani' (*In II Sent.*, 28 (Borgnet, xxvii), p. 479), and to use the terms 'errors', 'heresies', etc. indiscriminately. Thus, he refers both to the 'error' of Manichaeus and his 'heresy'; and describes Plato as being 'in error' and 'sinning', and the offending doctrine as 'heresy' (*In II Sent.*, 1.2-3, 5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 9–12, 13–9). Again, he says the view of Maimonides and others on angelic motion 'is heresy (because it is contrary to sacred Scripture)' (*In I Sent.*, 37.24 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 265–6); and that it seems heresy to him to say that human souls should remain on earth which '... is without doubt a heresy held by many of the people of the east, derived from the error of Pythagoras and Plato'; and, a few lines later, he describes Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* as founded as if on such an 'error' (*In II Sent.*, 6.6 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 134–5). However, Robert Grosseteste's early thirteenth-century description of heresy as 'an opinion chosen by human faculties, contrary to sacred scripture, openly held, and pertinaciously defended' appears to have become the standard definition for both academic and popular heresy (cit. *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe*, ed. E. Peters (Philadelphia, 1980), p. 167. Moreover, the term was normally limited to Christians – as Aquinas put it, 'heresy is a species of infidelity, attaching to those who profess faith in Christ yet corrupt his dogmas' (Aquinas, *Summa*, viii, p. 97, 2a2a.Q.11.a.1), although Pseudo-David of Augsburg, around the same time, noted one sense in which Jews could be viewed as heretics – if they promoted a biblical interpretation which was distorted in terms of Christianity (both cit. Bosworth, 'Perceptions', pp. 50–2).
- 12 See A.E. Larsen, 'Popular and Academic Heresy in England' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ph.D. thesis, 1998), pp. 13–4, 248–9. Thirteenth-century cases demonstrate academic debate allowed considerable flexibility, with apparently heretical ideas permitted in argumentation. Censured propositions provided guidelines for debate – but became critical when conclusions were drafted, with a status approaching that of conciliar statements. The way a scholar was treated depended on whether he promulgated such views outside the university, and, if so, whether he was politically protected, as well as whether he continued in his offending views once corrected (W.J. Courtenay, 'Inquiry and Inquisition', *Church History*, 58 (1989), especially p. 181).
- 13 Indeed, they would generally tend to fit the context for the original concept of heresy as set out by Tertullian, that 'philosophy is the ancestor of all heretics' – Tertullianus, *Adversus Hermogenem*, http://www.tertullian.org/latin/adversus_hermogenem.htm (12 November, 2018), VIII, 3 (cit. G. Verbeke, 'Philosophy and Heresy: Some Conflicts

- between Reason and Faith', in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th–13th C.)* (Leuven, 1976), pp. 172–97).
- 14 Gregory IX, *Decretalium*, v, 7.13, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals5.html> (2 January, 2017). Johannes Teutonicus' apparatus of glosses on Lateran IV, written almost immediately afterwards in 1215, stated (on Joachim of Fiore): 'Si paratus erat corrigi, non debebat dici hereticus, licet erraret in fide ...' (cf. *Constitutiones concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum commentariis glossatorum*, ed. A. García y García (Rome, 1981), p. 188). See also Albertus Magnus, *In IV Sent.*, 19.22 (Borgnet, xxix), p. 828, on distinguishing non-coercive fraternal from coercive judicial correction; Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, q. 28, pp. 503–4, on whether fraternal correction should proceed from justice or mercy. For the twelfth-century Paris masters' and reformers' perception of academic and popular heresy as related, and their influence, see J. Bird, 'The Construction of Orthodoxy and the (De)construction of Heretical Attacks', in C. Bruschi and P. Biller (eds.), *Texts and Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York, 2003), pp. 45–61.
 - 15 *CUP*, i, no. 128, pp. 170–2. The *CUP* footnotes state: "Hunc errorem ... excommunicamus" deest ubique, praeter Bibl. Arsen. et Matth. Paris'.
 - 16 J.H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power* (Philadelphia, 2001), pp. 42–4. The Council of Tarragona was mainly targeted against the Waldensians, although applying generally. See also J.H. Arnold, 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', in C. Bruschi and P. Biller (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York, 2003), p. 68. As Hans Thijssen noted, '[b]y labelling several ideas disseminated within a university context as heretical, medieval ecclesiastical authorities – either on purpose, or by lack of any other terminology – put *academic* heresies on a par with *popular* heresies' (J.M.M.H. Thijssen, 'Academic Heresy and Freedom at the University of Paris, 1200–1378', in J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning* (Leiden, 1995), pp. 217–28).
 - 17 Condemnations at medieval universities have been the subject of much recent research. Major discussions include J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998), Courtenay, 'Inquiry and Inquisition', pp. 168–81, G.S. Moule, *Corporate Jurisdiction, Academic Heresy, and Fraternal Correction* (Leiden, 2016).
 - 18 Doctrines, not individuals, were similarly in the dock in the contemporaneous Talmud Trial in 1240 (Y. Schwartz, 'Authority, Control, and Conflict in Thirteenth-Century Paris', in E. Baumgarten and J.D. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France* (New York, 2015), p. 96).
 - 19 For further details on the events summarised below, see below, pp. 57–65. For discussion of the differences between Amaury's academic censure and its successors and condemnations against heretics, see J.M.M.H. Thijssen, 'Master Amalric and the Amalricians', *Speculum*, 71 (1996), pp. 43, 48–9, n. 18. See also Ferruolo, *Origins of University*, pp. 288–95. Earlier papal interventions included by Pope Innocent II (at Bernard of Clairvaux's instigation) against Peter Abelard, 1140, and Gilbert of Poitiers, 1148, and by Pope Alexander III, 1164 (condemning various theological doctrines – including some from Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* from c. 1150 – and requiring Maurice of Sully, bishop of Paris, to ban their teaching throughout France). For Pope Alexander's follow-up actions in 1170 and 1177, see *CUP*, i, no. 3, p. 4, no. 9, pp. 8–9.
 - 20 *CUP*, i, no. 128, pp. 170–2 (based on Paris, Arsenal, MS 532, f.219r). The *CUP* forms the essential reference work for the university at Paris. However, its footnotes for the 1241/4 condemnation are not wholly clear and the manuscript list lacks precision and is incomplete (J.-G. Bougerol, 'A propos des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244', *AFH*, 80 (1987), p. 462, n. 3). L. Bianchi, 'Gli articoli censurati nel 1241/44', in F. Morenzoni and J.-Y. Tilliette (eds.), *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (+1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), p. 156, n. 3, describes an edited text as needed 'particolarmente

- urgente'. However, while acknowledging its limitations for the 1241/4 condemnation, W.J. Courtenay, 'The Registers of the University of Paris and the Statutes against the *Scientia Occamica*', *Vivarium*, 29:1 (1991), pp. 14–5, describes the *CUP* as 'a work of the highest scholarship' which mostly 'obviates the need to consult the manuscripts that lie behind it'.
- 21 W.J. Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', *Vivarium*, 32 (1994), pp. 186–90.
 - 22 Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv, pp. 280–3; Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, 23.2 (*Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72), iii), pp. 151–2; *ACP*, pp. 65–8; *ACG*, i, pp. 27, 80–1; *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus*, ed. C. du Plessis d'Argentré (3 vols., Paris, 1728–36), i, pp. 158, 186–7. The *Collectio* dates from the late thirteenth century, with subsequent additions. Although its original status is unknown, evidently it acquired some official standing (J.M.M.H. Thijssen, 'What Really Happened on 7 March 1277?', in E. Sylla and M. McVaugh (eds.), *Texts and Contexts* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 85–6, 106–14).
 - 23 D. Salman, 'Note sur la première influence d'Averroès', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), p. 204: 'L'époque antérieure [prior to 1270/77] n'étant guère connue, faute de documents, les historiens du XIII^e siècle ont été tout naturellement amenés à la lumière des témoignages postérieurs'.
 - 24 Where books and articles provide translations, I have used these with any significant changes noted. Otherwise, translations are my own.
 - 25 The earliest surviving statutes of the theology faculty at Paris stipulating the study of the *Sententiae* date from c.1335–6, but most historians agree that procedures were in place for at least 100 years previously – although the scarcity of extant commentaries prior to the mid-1240s suggests that writing a commentary on the *Sententiae* was not compulsory earlier (N. Spatz, 'Approaches and Attitudes to a New Theology Textbook', in N. Van Deusen (ed.), *The Intellectual Climate of the Early Universities* (Kalamazoo, 1997), pp. 27–52, citing Peter Comestor's metaphor of the *Sententiae* creating a path through the forest of patristic literature).
 - 26 However, caution is needed in any reliance on date alone to track the use of the new learning by theologians. The uptake of the new learning varied between theologians and depending on the topic. Beryl Smalley, 'A Commentary on Isaias by Guerric of Saint-Quentin, O.P.', *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (6 vols., Rome, 1946), ii (offprint), p. 8, contrasts Guerric of St-Quentin's commentary, pre-1242, which uses Aristotle's four causes from his *Physics* and *Metaphysics* (translated in the late twelfth century), with Hugh of St-Cher's only slightly earlier postilla, probably from c.1230–5, which still reflected the 'moralising' approach of Stephen Langton (†1228) from his period at Paris c.1200.
 - 27 P. Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *RTAM*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–5, 253–65. The 572 entries include 16 sermons, the transcription of a passage from Isidore of Seville (†636) and one from Praepositinus of Cremona (†1210), and a series of 43 questions copied from Stephen Langton or his school (Questions 339–81). 162 of the 510 remaining entries offer the name of the author.
 - 28 J.W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970); Ferruolo, *Origins of University*; Wei, *Intellectual Culture*; Young, *Scholarly Community*. J. Van Engen's introduction in Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 1–4, contains a brief summary of modern scholarship.
 - 29 Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 90–3. Augustine condemned inner intellectual freedom as *curiositas*, corrupting the mind through indulging the senses and grouped with pride and lust as the three categories of sin (E. Peters, 'Libertas inquirendi and the vitium curiositatis in Medieval Thought', in *La notion de liberté au Moyen Age*, Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia IV (Paris, 1985), pp. 90–1).
 - 30 Godfrey of Fontaines, *Les Quodlibets V, VI et VII*, eds. M. de Wulf et J. Hoffmans (Louvain, 1914), iii, quodlibet VII, Q. 18, pp. 402–5 (cit. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 91–2, 156).

- 31 The seminal study on the condemnation's derivation remains Marie-Dominique Chenu's 1947 article, 'Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale en Occident au XIII siècle', in *Melanges Auguste Pelzer* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 159–81, which provided the starting-point for much subsequent research. This analysed the various articles, concluding they were rooted in 'la théologie orientale', largely inspired by the Neoplatonism of the Greek Fathers. While accepting this proposition as a starting point, more recently Luca Bianchi, in his 2005 article, 'Gli articoli censurati', pp. 158–9, noted this 'teologia orientale' intertwined and interacted with other 'platonismi cristiani', including pseudo-Dionysius, Boethius and Eriugena, and with 'pensiero avicenniano'. Bianchi postulated that some of the theories resulting from this complicated mixture of theological traditions were widespread among Dominicans in particular. Other views include those of Richard Schenk in 2011, 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 184–7. Schenk viewed the condemnation in the context of 'a wider reaction around 1241 against the new Aristotelian influence ... at the university, since several of the theses suggest a tendency to reduce salvific-historical theology to philosophical-sapiential theology'.
- 32 A small number of other variations are noted and discussed in the main text.
- 33 Hexaemeral treatises were common, sometimes free-standing, and may be reflected in the ordering of topics in both Lateran IV and the condemnation. While the order of articles four to ten varies between manuscripts, this does not affect the condemnation's congruence with Lateran IV (for detailed discussion on ordering, see pp. 246–7, 249, n. 33).
- 34 Matt. vii:3–5.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Printed primary sources

- Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. B.M. Reichert (9 vols., Rome, 1898–1904).
- Acta Capitulorum Provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. M.J.C. Douais (Toulouse, 1894–95).
- Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia* ..., ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).
- Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1960).
- Bonaventure, *Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72).
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, ed. C. du Plessis d'Argentré (3 vols., Paris, 1728–36).
- Constitutiones concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum commentariis glossatorum*, ed. A. García y García (Vatican, 1981).
- Godfrey of Fontaines, *Les Quodlibets V, VI et VII*, eds. M. de Wulf and J. Hoffmans (Louvain, 1914).
- Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe*, ed. E. Peters (Philadelphia, 1980). <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812206807>
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83).
- Petrus Lombardus (Peter Lombard), *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1971–81).

Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem*, http://www.tertullian.org/latin/adversus_hermogene_m.htm (12 November 2018).

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, in *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita*, cura et studio Fratrum Praedicatorum (50 vols., Rome, 1862), iv–xii.

Printed secondary works

Arnold, J.H., *Inquisition and Power Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001).

Arnold, J.H., 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', in C. Bruschi and P. Biller (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York, 2003), pp. 63–80.

Baldwin, J.W., *Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970).

Bianchi, L., 'Gli articoli censurati nel 1241/1244 e la loro influenza da Bonaventura a Gerson', in F. Morenzoni and J.-Y. Tilliette (eds.), *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (†1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 155–71.

Bird, J., 'The Construction of Orthodoxy and the (De)construction of Heretical Attacks on the Eucharist in *Pastoralia* from Peter the Chanter's Circle in Paris', in C. Bruschi and P. Biller (eds.), *Texts and Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York, 2003), pp. 45–61.

Bougerol, J.-G., 'A propos des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 80 (1987), pp. 462–6.

Chenu, M.-D., 'Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale en Occident au XIII siècle', in *Melanges Auguste Pelzer: études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale offertes à A. Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 159–81.

Courtenay, W.J., 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion in the Thirteenth Century: The Cases of Stephen of Venizy, Peter of Tarentaise, and the Articles of 1270 and 1271', *Vivarium*, 32:2 (1994), pp. 186–95. doi:10.1163/156853494x00104

Courtenay, W.J., 'Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities', *Church History*, 58:2 (1989), pp. 168–81. doi:10.2307/3168722

Courtenay, W.J., 'The Institutionalization of Theology', in J. Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized: Teaching in the Medieval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 245–56.

Courtenay, W.J., 'The Registers of the University of Paris and the Statutes against the *Scientia Occamica*', *Vivarium*, 29:1 (1991), pp. 13–49. doi:10.1163/156853491x00026

Ferruolo, S.C., *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics, 1100–1215* (Stanford, California, 1985).

Glorieux, P., 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–52, 225–67.

Jordan, M.D., 'Philosophica disciplina: Learning to Teach Philosophy in a University', in J. Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized: Teaching in the Medieval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 111–27.

Leff, G., *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (New York, 1968).

Moule, G.S., *Corporate Jurisdiction, Academic Heresy, and Fraternal Correction at the University of Paris, 1200–1400* (Leiden, 2016).

Peters, E., 'Libertas inquirendi and the vitium curiositatis in Medieval Thought', in *La notion de liberté au Moyen Age. Islam, Byzance, Occident*, Penn-Paris-Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia IV, Session des 12–15 Octobre, 1982 (Paris, 1985), pp. 89–98.

18 Introduction

- Post, G., 'Parisian Masters as a Corporation, 1200–1246', *Speculum*, 9:4 (1934), pp. 421–45. doi:10.2307/2850224
- Putallaz, F.-X., 'Censorship', in R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2014), i, pp. 99–113.
- Sackville, L.J., *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011).
- Salman, D., 'Note sur la première influence d'Averroès', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), pp. 203–12. doi:10.3406/phlou.1937.3030
- Schenk, R., 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*: Thomism and Ecumenical Learning', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Anti-Christ or the Wisdom of God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 172–91.
- Schwartz, Y., 'Authority, Control, and Conflict in Thirteenth-Century Paris: Contextualizing the Talmud Trial', in E. Baumgarten and J.D. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France* (New York, 2015), pp. 93–110.
- Smalley, B., 'A Commentary on Isaias by Guerric of Saint-Quentin, O.P.', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (6 vols., Rome, 1946), ii (offprint), pp. 1–15.
- Spatz, N., 'Approaches and Attitudes to a New Theology Textbook: The *Sentences* of Peter Lombard', in N. Van Deusen (ed.), *The Intellectual Climate of the Early Universities: Essays in Honor of Otto Gründler* (Kalamazoo, 1997), pp. 27–52.
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., 'Academic Heresy and Freedom at the University of Paris, 1200–1378', in J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East* (Leiden, 1995), pp. 217–28.
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998).
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., 'Master Amalric and the Amalricians: Inquisitorial Procedure and the Suppression of Heresy at the University of Paris', *Speculum*, 71:1 (1996), pp. 43–65. doi:10.2307/2865200
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., 'What Really Happened on 7 March 1277? Bishop Tempier's Condemnation and its Institutional Context', in E. Sylla and M. McVaugh (eds.), *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 84–114.
- Van Engen, J., 'Introduction', in Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized: Teaching in the Medieval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 1–4.
- Verbeke, G., 'Philosophy and Heresy: Some Conflicts between Reason and Faith', in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th–13th c.) Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain, May 13–16, 1973* (Leuven, 1976), pp. 172–97.
- Verger, J., 'The First French Universities and the Institutionalization of Learning: Faculties, Curricula, Degrees', in J. Van Engen (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized: Teaching in the Medieval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2000), pp. 5–19.
- Wei, I.P., *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris* (Cambridge, 2012).
- Weijers, O., *Terminologie des universités au XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 1987).
- Young, S.E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215–1248* (Cambridge, 2014).

Unpublished theses

- Bosworth, L.E., 'Perceptions of the Origins and Causes of Heresy in Medieval Heresiology' (University of Edinburgh, Ph.D. thesis, 1995).
- Eby, J.C., 'The Petrification of Heresy: Concepts of Heterodoxy in the Early Middle Ages' (University of Washington, Ph.D. thesis, 1998).

- Kim, O.E., 'Canon Three of the Fourth Lateran Council, from 1215 to the Ordinary Gloss of 1241/66: Canonists' Contributions to the Delineation of Crime and Punishment for Heresy (University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. thesis, 2007).
- Larsen, A.E., 'Popular and Academic Heresy in England before the time of Wycliffe' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ph.D. thesis, 1998).
- Young, S.E., 'Queen of the Faculties: Theology and Theologians at the University of Paris, c.1215–c.1250' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ph.D. thesis, 2009).

Websites

- Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX. Compilatio Liber Quintus*, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals5.html> (2 January 2017).

1 The condemnation

This chapter sets out what is known or generally agreed about the imposition of the condemnation, including its dating, the number of times it was imposed, the process used and its likely authors and targets. It provides the immediate institutional context for the subsequent analysis. The condemnation was the first of this kind that we know of at the university at Paris. Many of the details are obscure. Its successors at Paris, in particular that of 1277, which contained around 219 articles and was directed primarily against the arts faculty, are better known and more researched – but the process used in 1277 cannot simply be extrapolated backwards. While events in the 1270s may offer guidance, as its predecessor the 1241/4 condemnation must be viewed with separate eyes.

Date and number of times imposed

The date and number of times the condemnation was imposed are disputed, but the majority of modern scholars favour a double imposition: a quasi-advisory imposition, censure, or even just publication, on 13 January 1241, probably with no penalty attached, followed by a quasi-judicial process on 5 January 1244, with excommunication as the sanction.¹ The manuscripts are divided on the date, but 1241 cannot be eliminated: it cannot easily be explained away as a palaeographic error in those manuscripts in which it appears (the year could be an error, but a scribe could not realistically have confused the reference in some manuscripts to 13 January – ‘in octava epiphanie’ – with 5 January – ‘nonis ianuarii’, the date found in others). A reference in the Dominican General Chapter, in Paris, at Whitsun 1243, to ‘errores condempnatos per magistros Parisienses’ is clear evidence that something of this nature happened previously, thus supporting 1241. But against this, the manuscript evidence taken as a whole supports 1244, and this is also the date given by Matthew Paris, who states that it was after the festival of St. Michael, 1243, i.e. after 29 September 1243, the start of the academic year, in an account which sets out the articles accurately.² Both dates cannot be right without some sort of double imposition.

There is also some literary evidence for a dual imposition. These include an intriguing passage from the English Franciscan, Roger Bacon, writing in the 1260s:

For with the university of Paris in convocation ('universitate Parisiensi convocata'), I twice saw and heard ('bis vidi et audiui') ... William [of Auvergne] bishop of Paris ... in the presence of all pronounce ('sententiare') that the agent intellect cannot be part of the mind; and ... Robert [Grosseteste] bishop of Lincoln and brother Adam of Marisco [Marsh] and his elders/superiors affirmed this same thing³

'Sententiare' could refer to a verdict or simply to the statement of a view. However, given the reference to 'in convocation ... in the presence of all', a significant, probably formal or quasi-formal occasion of some kind is implied. Bacon gives no dates, but 1241 and 1244 are both possible. The exact dates when Bacon was at the university in Paris are uncertain, but the late 1230s/1240s was probably the first period that he was there, as a master in the arts faculty, and William of Auvergne died in 1249.⁴

However, the condemnation does not include the agent intellect. There are, thus, three possibilities. First, Bacon could be referring to two different, otherwise unknown, events, probably in the 1240s, involving all members of the university, or at least all of the theologians there (although, if Bacon was himself lecturing in the arts faculty at the time, it would appear both faculties were involved). Given the relative scarcity of records, this could well be the case, but the condemnation must be a leading candidate. Second, Bacon's memory was wrong and the events never took place in that form or he has confused the topic. This is again possible but perhaps unlikely, given Bacon was himself interested in the agent intellect. Third, assuming there was indeed something William said on two major occasions which directly or indirectly related to the agent intellect and which Bacon remembered since it was relevant to his studies, then, given the complexity of the underlying issues this book envisages for each article in the condemnation, its pronouncement could well have been the occasion. There may be a link between the agent intellect and article seven on eternal truths (which appears to include the issue of how God and, by extrapolation, humans know, and hence the intellect's functioning); or a link with article eight on the eternity of the world – an eternal world could imply an infinity of souls, again with implications for how each functioned; or, since the agent intellect's role, including whether it was separate from the soul, whether it remained in souls after death and their continued individuality, was problematic, article one on the beatific vision could be in the frame.⁵ If so, Bacon's comment also sheds light on the formal process of the condemnation. It suggests that more than the bare articles may have been discussed at a convocation of university masters – that the background to and concerns over each may have been explained.

The commentary on the *Sententiae* by the Franciscan, and one-time student of Alexander of Hales, Odo Rigaud, written probably c.1243–5 when in Paris, also supports a double imposition.⁶ In commenting on distinctions one and ten of the first book, Odo stated in both passages: 'Sed hec opinio recessit ab aula' (literally, 'left the hall'). Articles one and three of the condemnation respectively reflect

these distinctions. Odo's commentary on the second book, distinction nine, which reflects article nine, used a different formulation:

To the next question, whether greater graces are given according to greater natural goods, we should say that 'according to' can mean causal, or fitting, or dispositional. If causal, it is completely false, and was condemned among the articles which were condemned by the masters with the bishop of Paris ('reprobatum inter articulos qui reprobati sunt a magistris cum episcopo Parisiensis').

This last formulation clearly indicates a formal condemnation. But the wording 'recessit ab aula' in the first two may suggest a different process – it could mean that the opinions were prohibited, with teaching them at the university forbidden. The most likely scenario is that Odo's references point to two different phases in the condemnation.⁷

Finally, a number of passages in works by Alexander of Hales, Gueric of St.-Quentin and others contained the banned propositions and were then corrected, a process which could arguably fit a double imposition.⁸ The original passages are unlikely to have been written following a formal condemnation carrying excommunication without stronger action against the authors than simply correction. However, their correction does not necessarily entail the existence of a previous censure – the passages, written before a formal condemnation, could have been corrected immediately on its issue to comply with it, or in anticipation of its single imposition if the results of the masters' deliberations were discussed and known in advance. There is no evidence whether this was common practice, but Alexander, for example, was one of the masters, so would have been well aware of their conclusions before they were announced.

A stronger argument for a double condemnation may come from a reference by the Dominican Gerard of Frachet in his *Vitae fratrum*, written c.1255–60. This refers to a certain very religious brother ('frater quidam valde religiosus') who nevertheless fell into novel opinions ('novas opiniones') which were judged erroneous and dangerous. However, he did not accept his error or correct his work.⁹ This has been interpreted as referring to 'Frater Stephanus', the only person named formally in any manuscript containing the text of the 1241/4 condemnation.¹⁰ If the attribution to Brother Stephanus is right, and also the identification commonly made by modern scholars of this individual with the Dominican Stephen of Venizy, then, given Stephen's untarnished future career (he became a master and was one of the signatories to the Talmud's condemnation in 1247/8), his intransigence seems unlikely in the face of a judicial condemnation.¹¹

There is also the case of John Pagus, connected with the condemnation through a fourteenth-century marginal annotation to one manuscript 'Errores Pagi'. Two contemporary references to Pagus' 'errores' reflect articles three and five of the condemnation, and an unexplained break in his lectures on the *Sententiae*, probably in early 1244, could reflect his failure to observe an initial

1241 censure and might have contributed to its subsequent formal re-imposition in 1244.¹²

Taken together, this adds weight to a dual process, but such a hypothesis still demands caution – there is no explicit reference to a double imposition as might have been expected somewhere among extant documents, and the evidence in its favour is circumstantial. However, the lack of any explicit reference to a dual process, or to two separate events, would not be unprecedented. A condemnation of the errors of John of Brescain and master Raymond in 1247 by Odo of Châteauroux, now papal legate, acting with the chancellor and theology masters at Paris and with the consent of the bishop, William of Auvergne, who was indisposed, was clearly a second hearing – the *CUP* entry refers to their earlier failure to mend their ways (for John, it states he had abjured under oath the errors which he had propounded in logic and for which he was well known and stood accused, whereas Raymond had at one time been transferred to prison by the Parisian master – presumably the bishop – according to the advice of the masters of theology for his uncorrected errors). However, there is no extant record of any earlier process (although the 1241/4 condemnation itself is not impossible).¹³ Thus, a two-stage condemnation remains the most likely scenario, an initial censure or pronouncement in 1241 followed by a formal condemnation in 1244. This book, therefore, adopts this hypothesis, albeit with a caveat, given the circumstantial nature of the evidence. Indeed, the 1241 imposition could well have been little more than the drawing up and internal circulation of an agreed list of errors, prior to a formal event in 1244.¹⁴

But even if the first imposition comprised little more than the production and circulation of such a list, two consequences follow. First, it throws the spotlight on the intervening years, 1241–4. In the case of John of Brescain and master Raymond, the second event states why it was needed – both had failed to submit to the previous rulings. Some explanation is therefore required – such as the large-scale circumvention of the list (or, if it was an official censure, the failures of those originally targeted, or of theologians at Paris more generally, to comply), or outside events or developments which could have increased sensitivities. The answer may well be a mixture of the two. Another factor could be the growing ambition of the theology masters at Paris, which this book postulates, to demonstrate their authority in all matters theological – even, possibly, to impress a new pope, following Pope Gregory IX's death in 1241 and Pope Innocent IV's accession in 1243 – resulting in their need to eliminate any views which did not meet the emerging orthodoxy. But this must remain speculation.

Second, two identical processes seem improbable. This leads to the second question, the imposition process and those involved.

Process

Given the lack of contemporary evidence for such instruments in this early period generally, and for the 1241/4 condemnation in particular, again any conclusions must be largely speculative. Moreover, the uncertainty over the likely first stage,

and the lack of parallels for it, prevent its separate analysis. However, it appears from the introductory lines that the condemnation fell within the disciplinary consistory of the chancellor, one of four tribunals probably existing at the time.¹⁵

As regards the authority under which the chancellor acquired this role, an oath taken by bachelors of theology, first recorded in 1364, set out rules on prescribed doctrines and proper morals – the bachelors were required to report anyone contravening the oath to the bishop or chancellor within seven days. While this may not have been in place as early as the condemnation, in particular for the mendicants, the same principles of morality and doctrinal conformity were encapsulated in the 1215 university statutes and in Pope Gregory IX's 1231 papal bull for the university, *Parens scientiarum*. *Parens scientiarum* also specified the roles to be taken by the different authorities: it required the chancellor to satisfy himself on the worthiness of any candidate for a licence to teach theology before bestowing it; it gave authority to the masters to legislate their own 'constitutions ('constitutiones')' and 'ordinances ('ordinationes')' and punish those contravening these; and it gave the bishop the right to punish miscreants to preserve the honour of the scholars ('scholarium servetur honestas').¹⁶ Thus, from the early thirteenth century, theology masters at Paris took on a formal role as guardians of proper doctrine. They operated under the bishop's authority and the chancellor's direction, but the masters' collective expertise and cooperation were critical.¹⁷ The contrast here with the earlier ban on Eriugena's *Periphyseon* in 1225 is significant. In 1225 the pope took the lead, instructing archbishops and others to comply.¹⁸ In 1241/4 the bishop of Paris, its chancellor and the theology masters shared in the decision, with separate roles but a self-regulatory, collaborative and collective approach.

The developing role of the chancellor supports this overall picture. Freeing the masters from his restrictive practices when awarding teaching licences, etc., was a major preoccupation as the twelfth-century schools developed into a university. But chancellors themselves appear to have responded by developing their own role, consciously or unconsciously, becoming more collaborative with the theology masters. Philip the Chancellor (chancellor 1217–36) supported the university in the 1229–31 strike. He was also, unusually, a leading theologian, as was Praepositinus of Cremona (chancellor 1206–9). Odo of Châteauroux was involved in doctrinal issues with the masters throughout his chancellorship (1238–44), not just the 1241/4 condemnation but, perhaps most notably, action against the Jews in the early 1240s. Moreover, his sermon output was prodigious, many of which were aimed at university scholars, and his name is associated with the banning of Eriugena's *Periphyseon*.¹⁹ Thus, the relationship between theology masters and chancellor seems to have become more collective, although tensions would certainly have remained.

William Courtenay combines the different opening lines of the 1241/4 condemnation, which refer variously to William of Auvergne as bishop of Paris, Odo of Châteauroux as chancellor and the theology masters (often mentioning Alexander of Hales), to offer one possible reconstruction. This appears to apply specifically to the formal process – its probable second stage – although he is sympathetic to the theory of a double imposition. He envisages William delegating the

judicial process to Odo and the theology masters, with Odo in charge. William then approved the result and imposed excommunication on anyone maintaining the banned propositions. However, as Courtenay notes, from the limited information available, the exact process and who compiled the propositions cannot be determined, nor who brought an accusation against ‘Brother Stephanus’ – the only named culprit in only one manuscript.²⁰ Nevertheless, Courtenay concludes that the faculty of theology had now become the main judicial forum in Paris for such cases; and, albeit judging from later practice, he argues the Dominican convent of St.-Jacques probably provided the venue, with university members assembled there, or anyway its masters, although there would not have been room for all.²¹

Courtenay’s reconstruction seems largely persuasive. However, whether single or double, I am dubious about too close an association of any ‘Frater Stephanus’, whether the Dominican Stephen of Venizy, with whom he is usually identified, or any other single Dominican or Franciscan, with the proceedings.²² This is for four reasons. First, there is only one reference to him, and he is not mentioned by, for example, Matthew Paris. Second, for any one person to have advocated all ten very different propositions seems unlikely – although anyone commenting on Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae* would have covered all the topics in the condemnation, it seems unlikely he would have contravened the emerging orthodoxy on all of them, and, indeed, none of those discussed in Appendix B did so.²³ Third, albeit evidence from omission is dangerous, numerous others were implicated and not mentioned. They could have been too famous to be publicly shamed or their views not yet identified, but Matthew Paris clearly knew more theologians were involved, principally Dominicans and Franciscans, and, even if subsequently, some of these culprits were in fact identified.²⁴ Finally, in contrast to the proceedings against other individuals, such as John of Brescain, where the culprit is clearly associated with specific errors in some detail, specific errors are not attributed to ‘Frater Stephanus’, although this again is evidence from omission rather than positive proof.²⁵

Individuals and faculties

This raises the question whether any individuals were in fact associated with the condemnation, whether any were known to have needed bringing into line. The simplistic answer must be yes. ‘Frater Stephanus’ is named in one manuscript; John Pagus, by then in the theology faculty, is also associated with the banned propositions, and numerous others had to be corrected. John of Brescain, from the arts faculty, may also be in the frame.²⁶ But if so, was the condemnation imposed to correct such individuals? Simplistically, again the answer must be a qualified yes. Had no scholars needed to be pulled up, there would have been no underlying problem to trouble the theology faculty. But this ignores both the range of errors, many as yet unidentified with individuals, and, more important, the strong arguments supporting the internal coherence of the articles and their link to Lateran IV – if, as this book contends, the condemnation’s contents reflected concerns

across the broad spectrum of teaching in areas seen by Lateran IV as crucial to proper Catholic doctrine and to the faculty's (and, perhaps, Dominican school's) reputation and mission. The need to correct the views of some individuals now viewed as contravening the emerging orthodoxy was merely a symptom of a more fundamental need to 'repair' doctrine at Paris to allow its theologians to fulfil their role properly. The most likely scenario, therefore, is that contemporaries identified some individuals whose names then found their way into the records. This was the case in the 1277 condemnation, where a few manuscripts have a notation of the two arts masters commonly associated with its errors, Siger of Brabant and Boethius of Dacia, and the document itself is about 'quidam', unnamed opponents.

The genesis of the 1270 Paris condemnation, the predecessor to that of 1277, may throw further light on the process, although caution is needed in such backwards extrapolation. Initially, a Dominican student sent to Albertus Magnus a list of fifteen views being taught in the Paris schools by reputed philosophers. Albertus considered all of these contained errors and, when the list reached Stephen Tempier, then bishop of Paris, he condemned thirteen of them. This suggests the trigger was opinions being taught generally, rather than individual suspects, and, if transposed to 1241/4, would explain the lack of official attribution to any individuals (with the exception in one manuscript).²⁷

Finally, the condemnation preambles do not specify to whom its prescriptions applied. However, the evidence that they applied to the theology faculty at Paris is overwhelming. This includes the people involved in its application, although this is not in itself conclusive given the superior role theologians were gradually acquiring over those in the arts faculty. Other indications include the subsequent actions by the Dominicans collectively to ensure their order eradicated the banned views, the texts by theologians reflecting the banned propositions, Matthew Paris' account referring to 'magistri theologiae ...', etc. Whether it also applied to those in the arts faculty is less clear, but in any case, it must have been known throughout the university.²⁸ Moreover, where their discussions related to the areas it covered, those in the arts faculty must surely have been expected to comply, given the strictures imposed on them, for example in the 1215 university statutes, and the fact that many of them would advance to studying theology subsequently (or indeed simultaneously).²⁹ The fact that their works did not tarnish the theology faculty's reputation, and were of less interest to the ecclesiastical authorities, could have meant that they could be ignored, but, given the connections between the two faculties and the progression of students between them, coupled with their inclusion in other, earlier, prohibitions, this seems unlikely.³⁰

Conclusion

Given the present state of the evidence no firm conclusions are possible, but the identity of those imposing the condemnation and their likely roles are relatively certain, as is its probable double imposition.³¹ Whether any specific culprits were formally identified and censured is less clear. However, with the articles themselves covering such a wide range of areas, it is likely that, whether or not

the process was one of individual censure, the condemned propositions were ones that were being widely discussed both in the theology faculty and at the Dominican school at Paris (given the heavy Dominican representation among those inculpated and the fact that Dominicans figured so strongly in Matthew Paris' account).³²

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 The debate on the condemnation's date originated in 1927 with André Callebaut, 'Alexander de Halès, O.F.M. et ses confrères', *La France Franciscaine*, 10 (1927), pp. 189–272, who argued that it was imposed twice, in 1241 and 1244. Franz Pelster, 'Die Pariser Verurteilung von 1241', *AFP*, 18 (1948), pp. 405–17, disagreed, arguing instead for 1241, the date contained in the manuscript adopted by the *CUP*, but Victorin Doucet, 'La date des condamnations parisiennes dites de 1241', in *Mélanges A. Pelzer* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 183–93, supported Callebaut on a double imposition, followed in 1987 by Jacques-Guy Bougerol, 'A propos des condamnations parisiennes', *AFH*, 80 (1987), pp. 462–6. This view is now generally, although not universally, accepted, including, in 1994, by William Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', *Vivarium*, 32:2 (1994), pp. 186–90, and, in 2005, by Luca Bianchi, 'Gli articoli censurati nel 1241/1244', in F. Morenzoni and J.-Y. Tilliette (eds.), *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (†1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 156–7. Discussions on date also touched on the process of condemnation, for example, whether its issue in 1241 was as a penalty-free censure, with that in 1244 a more judicial event. The most substantive discussion is that of Courtenay in 1994, supported by Bianchi in 2005. See also P. Glorieux, 'Les années 1242–1247 à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris', *RTAM* 29 (1962), pp. 234–49; J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998), *passim*.
- 2 *ACG*, i, p. 27; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv, pp. 280–3.
- 3 Roger Bacon, *Opus maius*, ed. J.H. Bridges (3 vols., Turnhout, 2010), iii, 2.5, p. 47.
- 4 Bacon must have been in Paris by 1245, probably earlier (A. Power, *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 37–8).
- 5 It is possible that Bacon was studying theology while lecturing on the arts – see n. 29 below. Given that Bacon studied the agent intellect at Paris in the 1240s (D. Salman, 'Note sur la première influence d'Averroès', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), pp. 203–12), he should have recalled anything that William of Auvergne said on this subject accurately. See also T.N. Noone, 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*', *Vivarium*, 3 (1997), pp. 256–7; R.C. Dales, 'Robert Grosseteste's Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World', *Speculum*, 61 (1986), pp. 557–8. For the agent (or active intellect), see below, p. 108, n. 119.
- 6 For the date, see W.C. Jordan, 'Archbishop Eudes Rigaud and the Jews of Normandy 1248–1275', in S.E. Myers and S.J. McMichael (eds.), *The Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Leiden, 2004), p. 41.
- 7 For this interpretation, see Doucet, 'La date', pp. 188–90. Doucet notes it was the difference between Odo Rigaud's two descriptions (Bruges, MS 208, ff. 8va, 45va-b, contrasted with f. 231ra) that first made him question a single imposition.
- 8 For details, see Appendix B.
- 9 Gerard de Fracheto, *Vitae Fratrum*, ed. B.M. Reichert (Louvain, 1896), i, p. 208.
- 10 For example, Doucet, 'La date', p. 463, n. 8, assumes this equation.

- 11 For doubts over the identification of Stephen of Venizy, see below, pp. 25, 28–9, n. 22. For the Talmud's condemnation, see below, pp. 90–1, 116, n. 199.
- 12 H. Hansen, *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories* (Leuven, 2012), p. 20, n. 23, citing and dating Vat., Lat., MS 692, f. 179v (the fourteenth-century manuscript), and Anon, *Tractatus de fide secundum diversos magistros* (Münster, Universitätsbibl., MS 257, ff. 72vb–73va) and Paris, Bibl. Nat., Lat., MS 15652, f. 54rb (the two contemporary manuscripts). For details on Pagus, see Glorieux, 'Les années', pp. 234–49. Gregory IX wrote to Louis IX in 1231 about 'master John Pagus' (*CUP*, i, no. 90, pp. 145–6). Heine Hansen argues Pagus was an arts master then, but subsequently became a theologian, with his lectures on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* dating to c. 1243–5. Marie-Dominique Chenu, 'Maîtres et bacheliers de l'Université de Paris v. 1240', *Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIII^e siècle*, 1 (1932), p. 34, suggests Pagus' lectures on the *Sententiae* could have started as early as 1240 – but the break could still follow the condemnation's first imposition.
- 13 *CUP*, i, no. 176, pp. 206–8. It is certainly tempting to see the first process where John was rebuked as the 1241/4 condemnation (the timing fits, but too little is still known about John and his errors – below, n. 26). Raymond's exact errors are unspecified.
- 14 For the view that there were two condemnations, the first internal to the theology masters, the second, in 1244, the full formal process, see J. Miethke, 'Papst, Ortsbischof und Universität', in A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1976), p. 6.
- 15 Hans Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 5–19, while stressing the need for caution in extrapolating backwards, distinguishes four tribunals for dealing with charges of false teaching at Paris, largely based on fourteenth-century cases: 'the [disciplinary] consistory of the chancellor and masters of theology', 'the episcopal court, the papal court, and a [disciplinary] forum of the minister general of a religious order and his advisers'. Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', pp. 193–4, argues that where an allegation was first reported was important, but any supposed jurisdictional conflict between chancellor and bishop has been exaggerated, since both could involve the same process, with the chancellor, under the bishop's authority, engaging the theology masters in the assessment. Any resultant censure could issue as an episcopal letter, or, as in 1241/4, as an edict of the chancellor and theological faculty, under the bishop's authority or in his name. Lateran IV, canon 8 (*Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 237–9), legislated for a process of 'inquisitio' for 'irregularities' of clerics, triggered by 'complaint and report' reaching their superiors (rather than specific accusation, 'accusatio'). Courtenay's reconstruction appears to envisage the 1241/4 process started with an 'accusatio', but it could have been an 'inquisitio'.
- 16 *CUP*, iii, no. 1299, pp. 120–2 (c.f. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 9, 126–7, nn. 44, 46–7); Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', pp. 186–90, 193–5; *CUP*, i, no. 20, pp. 78–80, no. 79, pp. 136–9.
- 17 W.J. Courtenay, 'Inquiry and Inquisition', *Church History*, 58:2 (1989), p. 173.
- 18 For the *Periphyseon*, see below, pp. 57–61.
- 19 S.E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 74. For the Jews and for Eriugena, see below, pp. 90–4, 57–61.
- 20 Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16360, f. 3r.
- 21 Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', pp. 186–90. For the use of St.-Jacques for university business, see M.M. Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study' (Toronto, 1998), pp. 26–7. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 9–12, extrapolating backwards from the 1360s, suggests that initially such cases may have been evaluated privately by a disciplinary tribunal of masters and the chancellor, with the suspect allowed to correct their errors and recant. A public recantation before the whole university would follow.
- 22 The equation of 'Frater Stephanus' with Stephen of Venizy is generally accepted, as no other Dominican or Franciscan is identifiable at the university in 1241/4. However,

- most friars studying at Paris did not aim for a degree, so the list of known masters is misleading (D.L. D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 134–5). An unrecorded Stephen is therefore possible.
- 23 T. Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* (4 vols., Rome, 1970–93), i, p. 360: 'Articuli reperti in expos. *I sent.* Fr. Stephani, ab Univ. Paris. condemnati (13.1.1241)', citing: 'Mss., ed.: Chart. Univ. Paris. I, 170–2, n. 128'. However, Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16360, f. 3r, the only manuscript that refers to 'Frater Stephanus', does not contain the reference 'in expos. *I sent.*' Moreover, even if the reference is right, the condemned propositions are not restricted to the first book of the *Sententiae*.
 - 24 Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, iv, p. 280: 'magistri theologiae, praecipue tamen praecipui Praedicatorum et Minorum lectores'. Roger Bacon's and Odo Rigaud's descriptions of the pronouncements, if they indeed refer to the condemnation, make no reference to individuals or individual censures. However, double jeopardy (i.e. the need not to prejudice subsequent judicial proceedings) could have been an issue in the apparent anonymity of the 1277 condemnation (Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, pp. 43, 48, 141, n. 41); and this could have applied in 1241/4.
 - 25 J.M.M.H. Thijssen, 'What Really Happened on 7 March 1277?', in E. Sylla and M. McVaugh (eds.), *Texts and Contexts* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 85–7, 106–14, summarises the opening passages from the various condemnations in the *Collectio errorum in anglia et parisiis condemnatorum*. He provides two examples of lists, one from a late fourteenth-century manuscript (Auxerre, Bibl. Mun., MS 243, f.78rb), the other from an early printed edition. Thijssen comments that, unlike all the other condemnations from Paris in the list, the Paris 1277 condemnation is the only one which does not specify the culprit. However, Auxerre, Bibl. Mun., MS 243 does not specify 'Frater Stephanus' or anyone else as guilty (although the 1241/4 condemnation figures in it twice), and the early printed list does not include the 1241/4 condemnation.
 - 26 The inclusion of Stephen's name in one manuscript suggests that he was known as guilty, probably named during the process, and with a more formal association than John Pagus, who is mentioned only in a manuscript annotation, not in any manuscript preamble. John of Brescain's errors were committed while studying logic – he was a 'clericus', condemned by the bishop, chancellor and theology masters at Paris. He argued: 'lucem creatam minimum in genere substantie et habere has tres proprietates: infinitatem, immensitatem et essentiam', together with other errors 'que fere ad Arianam heresim' (*CUP*, i, no. 176, p. 206). The reference to 'lucem creatam' may link to discussion on the nature of bodily vision of the divine light, relevant to article one (the beatific vision). For Greek views on the divine light, see G. Geréby, 'Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 200–3. The reference to the Arian heresy concerned the Trinity, potentially relevant to articles two and three. C. du Plessis D'Argentré (†1740) noted that the Greek theologian, Gregory Palamas (†1359) 'stated falsely [in 1330] that [there is] a certain light uncreated and coeternal with God ('increatedum et coaeternum Deo'), which is visible to our eye' and that 'those very virtues of God are in reality distinct from his essence ('ipsas virtutes Dei ab essentia revera distinctas esse')' (*Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus*, ed. C. du Plessis d'Argentré (3 vols., Paris, 1728–36), i, p. 323, cit. M. de Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. P. Coffey (London, 1909), section 361, n. 1). D'Argentré connected the second error with both John of Brescain and Gilbert of Poitiers. John of Brescain's errors could thus also have related to article seven (eternal truths).
 - 27 Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', pp. 191–2.
 - 28 Roger Bacon's reference to 'universitate Parisiensi convocata' supports this. Moreover, he was himself a master of arts at the time (but see n. 29 below).
 - 29 Arts masters often studied in the theology faculty, continuing their teaching to finance their studies (W.J. Courtenay, *Teaching Careers at the University of Paris* (Notre Dame,

- Indiana, 1988), p. 22). The quadrivium, for example astronomy, included issues related to areas such as time (one of the issues in article eight). Indeed, Richard Rufus wrote a commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, relevant to article eight, probably as an arts student in Paris, c.1235.
- 30 If John of Brescain's 1247 condemnation can be linked to that of 1241/4, since he was studying logic and thus would have been in the arts faculty, the application of the condemnation to that faculty would be confirmed.
- 31 For example, Jürgen Miethke ('Papst, Ortsbischof und Universität', p. 66) holds the sources on the condemnation are insufficient to understand it, but singles out a possible role for Odo of Châteauroux. It is unclear whether the faculty of theology as a whole, or an individual, took the initiative. Given that so many Dominicans were incriminated, and that the order subsequently took such direct action, another candidate could be the Dominican Master General. Raymond of Peñafort (master 1238–40) and John of Wildeshausen (master 1241–52) both favoured strict discipline. However, Raymond was absolved from his position at the General Chapter at Whitsun 1240, and John, who endorsed the condemnation at the General Chapter at Whitsun 1243, only became master in May 1241, i.e. after the probable date of its first imposition. He could, however, have inspired the second imposition.
- 32 The 1240 Dominican General Chapter, *ACG*, i, p. 16, provided for prisons to confine the outrage ('insolenciam') of the corrupt ('perversorum'). This suggests both strong central discipline and its necessity.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Manuscript and archival sources

Auxerre, Bibl. Mun., MS 243.
 Bruges, MS 208.
 Münster, Universitätsbibl., MS 257.
 Paris, BN., Lat., MS 15652.
 Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16360.
 Vat., Lat., MS 692.

Printed primary sources

Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, ed. B.M. Reichert (9 vols., Rome, 1898–1904).
 Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia* ..., ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).
Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, ed. C. du Plessis d'Argentré (3 vols., Paris, 1728–36).
Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London and Washington, 1990).
 Gerard de Fracheto, *Vitae fratrum*, ed. B.M. Reichert (Louvain, 1896).
 Kaeppli, T., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* (4 vols., Rome, 1970–93).
 Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83).
 Roger Bacon, *Opus maius*, ed. J.H. Bridges (3 vols., Turnhout, 2010).

Printed secondary works

- Bianchi, L., 'Gli articoli censurati nel 1241/1244 e la loro influenza da Bonaventura a Gerson', in F. Morenzoni and J.-Y. Tilliette (eds.), *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (†1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 155–71.
- Bougerol, J.-G., 'A propos des condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 80 (1987), pp. 462–6.
- Callebaut, A., 'Alexandre de Halès, O.F.M. et ses confrères en face de condamnations parisiennes de 1241 et 1244', *La France Franciscaine*, 10 (1927), pp. 257–72.
- Chenu, M.-D., 'Maîtres et bacheliers de l'Université de Paris v. 1240: description du ms. Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 15652', *Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIII^e siècle*, 1 (1932), pp. 11–39.
- Courtenay, W.J., 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion in the Thirteenth Century: The Cases of Stephen of Venizy, Peter of Tarentaise, and the Articles of 1270 and 1271', *Vivarium*, 32:2 (1994), pp. 186–95. doi:10.1163/156853494x00104
- Courtenay, W.J., 'Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities', *Church History*, 58:2 (1989), pp. 168–81. doi:10.2307/3168722
- Courtenay, W.J., *Teaching Careers at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1988).
- Dales, R.C., 'Robert Grosseteste's Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World', *Speculum*, 61:3 (1986), pp. 544–63. doi:10.2307/2851595
- D'Avray, D.L., *The Preaching of the Friars – Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985).
- Doucet, V., 'La date des condamnations parisiennes dites de 1241. Faut-il corriger le cartulaire de l'université?', in *Mélanges A. Pelzer: études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale offertes à A. Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 183–93.
- Geréby, G., 'Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine and Latin Theological Debates: Monarchianism and Crypto-Dyophysitism', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 183–211.
- Glorieux, P., 'Les années 1242–1247 à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 29 (1962), pp. 234–49.
- Hansen, H., *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories a Study and Edition of the Rationes Super Praedicamenta Aristotelis* (Leuven, 2012).
- Jordan, W.C., 'Archbishop Eudes Rigaud and the Jews of Normandy 1248–1275', in S.E. Myers and S.J. McMichael (eds.), *The Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 39–52.
- Miethke, J., 'Papst, Ortsbischof und Universität in den Pariser Theologenprozessen des 13. Jahrhunderts', in A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1976), pp. 52–94.
- Mulchahey, M.M., *'First the Bow is Bent in Study' – Dominican Education before 1350* (Toronto, 1998).
- Noone, T.B., 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: A Search for the Grounds of Disagreement', *Vivarium*, 35:2 (1997), pp. 251–65. doi:10.1163/1568534972662556
- Pelster, F., 'Die Pariser Verurteilung von 1241', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 18 (1948), pp. 405–17.
- Power, A., *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013).

- Salman, D., 'Note sur la première influence d'Averroès', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), pp. 203–12. doi:10.3406/phlou.1937.3030
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris 1200–1400* (Philadelphia, 1998).
- Thijssen, J.M.M.H., 'What Really Happened on 7 March 1277? Bishop Tempier's Condemnation and its Institutional Context', in E. Sylla and M. McVaugh (eds.), *Texts and Contexts in Ancient and Medieval Science* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 84–114.
- de Wulf, M., *History of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. P. Coffey (London, 1909).
- Young, S.E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215–1248* (Cambridge, 2014).

2 The ten articles

Chapter 3 discusses the complex concepts and influences that lie behind both the individual condemned propositions and their overall formulation and production. This chapter concentrates on what the articles actually say, to provide a factual basis to focus the discussion in Chapter 3 before the detailed analysis of the underlying influences in Chapter 4.

Within each article, the term ‘proposition’ is used for the doctrine now being condemned. The term ‘truth’ is used for the theological view which the condemnation establishes as the orthodox position to be followed.¹

Article one

Primus [error], quod divina essentia in se nec ab homine nec ab angelo videbitur.

Hunc errorem reprobamus et assertores et defensores auctoritate Wilhermi episcopi excommunicamus. Firmiter autem credimus et asserimus, quod Deus in sua essentia vel substantia videbitur ab angelis et omnibus sanctis et videtur ab animabus glorificatis.²

The first condemned proposition concerns the beatific vision, a major and controversial theological issue from the time of Augustine onwards.³ The proposition states that the divine essence will not be seen in itself by humans or angels. Some manuscripts are more specific, with references to glorified souls and the use of the present as well as the future tense. However, this does not alter the sense – if angels and humans will be unable to see the divine essence in the future, they are hardly likely to be able to see it now. The proper doctrine, or truth, states that God will be seen in his essence or substance by angels and all the saints and is seen by glorified souls. Some versions add ‘or nature’, but this appears to add little or nothing to the preceding concepts.⁴ More significantly, one variation in several manuscripts omits the present tense from the truth, which therefore only provides for the vision of God’s essence to angels, saints and glorified spirits in the future.⁵ This makes more sense, as it seems odd for glorified souls to be vouchsafed the vision before both angels and saints. While not spelt out, the truth clearly implies the vision is direct, with no medium intervening.⁶

The doctrinal issues fall into three main groups.⁷ In broad terms, the first concerns the *object* of the vision, including whether this is Christ or God, whether God's divine 'essence' or his 'energies' and whether this 'essence' can be seen but only as 'power'. The second concerns *when* the saints, glorified souls and, where relevant, angels might see or know God: in this life, immediately after death, or only after Judgment Day. The third concerns *how* we might see God, including what is meant by biblical references to 'face-to-face', the question of whether a medium intervenes or we see from 'under the altar' and how the beatific vision is activated. The three groups are interdependent: for example, the answer to the question 'what is the object of the vision' may (or may not) differ according to whether it refers to before or after Judgment Day.

The main problem over the beatific vision arose from conflicting biblical texts – coupled with sometimes conflicting patristic interpretation of them – on whether God's essence could ever be seen. Within this, there are three specific periods: on earth (with body and soul combined, although out-of-body experiences were a major topic); after death but before Judgment Day (with souls disembodied); and after Judgment Day (with the body, now purified, and soul reunited).⁸ Issues included, for those accepting the beatific vision was of God's essence but denying its possibility before Judgment Day, what vision existed earlier. For those asserting saints achieved such vision immediately on death, what enhancement, if any, happened on Judgment Day was unclear; but conversely, if one factor preventing the vision of God's essence on earth was the body, arguably those between death and resurrection were better off before Judgment Day, despite the bodily purification accompanying this. Then there was the difficulty in a created being ever seeing an uncreated one; and, a debate that developed in the thirteenth century, a finite being seeing an infinite one, especially since the infinite God was without parts and indivisible, so could not be seen partially. Added to this was whether *seeing* differed from *knowing*, and whether knowledge was confined to universals (while God was a particular). These and other questions resulted in numerous permutations. Vladimir Lossky summarises the overall dilemma succinctly: 'If the essence of God is unknowable by definition, how will we be able to know God as He is, according to the word of St. John [1.Jn. iii:2]. On the other hand, if in the age to come His essence is to be an object of beatific knowledge for created intellects, in what sense must we conceive the unknowable nature of God as affirmed by the Scriptures?'⁹

Articles two and three

Secundus, quod licet divina essentia una sit in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, tamen ut in ratione forme una est in Patre et Filio, sed non una in hiis cum Spiritu Sancto, et tamen forma hec idem sit quod divina essentia.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod una est essentia sive substantia in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto et eadem essentia in ratione forme.¹⁰

Tertius, quod Spiritus Sanctus, prout est nexus vel amor, non procedit a Filio, sed tantum a Patre.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod prout est nexus vel amor, procedit ab utroque.¹¹

Articles two and three both concern the Trinity and, because they may well be symbiotic, they need to be considered together.

Article two appears self-contradictory: the offending proposition states that the divine essence is one in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but as regards form ('in ratione forme') it is one in the Father and Son but not the Holy Spirit; but this form is the same as the divine essence. The truth states that the essence or substance (or, as added in some manuscripts, nature) is the same in all three persons and the essence is the same as regards form. The article is one of the most complex in the condemnation, reflecting the intractability of the underlying debate. It derives from attempts by theologians to understand the seemingly impenetrable problem of how the three persons of the Trinity can be different yet all one undivided divine essence, in this case focussing specifically on the Holy Spirit. The problem gave rise to numerous discussions on the single essence, on the 'notions' (such as paternity, for the Father) and on the three persons (where the main options for distinguishing them were based either on their inter-relationships or their origins).

The issue underlying article three is much simpler. The condemned proposition states that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father, while the truth states that it proceeds from both the Father and the Son. Both proposition and truth include the Holy Spirit's role as the love or connection between the two, reflecting Augustine's position, incorporated into Catholic orthodoxy, which established the dual procession as Catholic doctrine. This element is absent from Greek doctrine, but the proposition broadly reflects the Greek position in the long-standing *filioque* controversy.

Article four

Quartus, quod anime glorificate non sunt in celo empireo cum angelis, nec corpora glorificata erunt ibi, sed in celo aqueo vel cristallino, quod supra firmamentum est, quod et de beata Virgine presumitur.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod idem locus corporalis, scilicet celum empireum, angelorum et animarum sanctarum erit et corporum glorificatorum.¹²

The condemned proposition in article four expels glorified souls and bodies from the empyrean heaven where angels reside, placing them instead in the aqueous or crystalline heaven above the firmament. The Virgin Mary's inclusion (in most, but not all, the manuscripts) goes against the normal trend of her potential elevation closer to God – most discussions either raise her to the heaven of the Trinity (above the empyrean), or to an elevated position within the empyrean itself.

As regards the underlying issue, the truth, but not the proposition, specifies the empyrean heaven is a ‘locus corporalis’, which suggests the problem of mixing corporeal with incorporeal substances may have been the concern, and that implicit in the proposition is the physical nature of the empyrean heaven itself in relation to its occupants. Although contemporary texts do not appear to contend that the empyrean heaven is incorporeal, several discuss how angels – its original and established inhabitants – could exist in such a place, given their incorporeality. For example, William of Auvergne, with others, noted a difficulty in the statement of ‘theologians, saints and doctors ... that heaven, as soon as it was created, was filled with angels’, since ‘if that heaven is a bodily place, it could only be filled with bodies of substance. For spiritual substances, just as they also do not have corporeal magnitude, thus neither could they fill a place’. William contended that such arguments from ‘the unlearned (‘imperiti’)’ mocked ‘genuine and divinely revealed holy words and writings’, noting human souls live in bodies, which themselves inhabit houses, etc., with no difficulty.¹³

The hypothesis that the issue of corporeality underlies article four is supported by the variant reading of the truth found in some manuscripts and in Matthew Paris’ version: ‘... that the same corporeal place (‘idem locus corporalis’), namely the empyrean heaven of the angels and the souls of the saints, will be both the same [place] of glorified humans and similarly the same common spiritual place of humans and angels (‘locus idem communis spiritualis hominum et angelorum’)’. This emphasises the empyrean heaven’s dual nature, corporeal and spiritual, and role (for angels and humans). However, while this makes sense, it is perhaps salutary to note Albertus Magnus’ apparent bafflement:

Some have said (I do not know why, because no reason supports it) that men will be in the aqueous heaven, and angels in the empyrean heaven: but this is nonsense (‘nihil’): because our bodies will be at that time ennobled exceeding (‘ultra’) the nobility of the empyrean: and therefore there is no objection in respect of the body.¹⁴

However, even while expressing incredulity, Albertus appears to see the body, this time human corporeality, as the issue here.

Articles five and ten

Quintus, quod malus angelus in principio sue creationis fuit malus, et nunquam fuit nisi malus.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod bonus creatus sit et post peccando factus sit malus.¹⁵

Decimus, quod malus angelus nunquam habuit, unde stare posset, nec etiam Adam in statu innocentie.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod uterque habuit, unde posset stare, non tamen, unde posset proficere.¹⁶

Article five concerns whether the evil angel was created evil or was created good and became evil through sin. Although the context is different, the issue is related to that in article ten, whether the evil angel or Adam in his state of innocence had a place to stand before they fell. Both cover the question of evil, its origin and whether it could have been avoided. Both were often discussed together in contemporary texts.

There are no significant textual variations in either article, although one manuscript adds the words ‘ab initio’ before ‘unde’ in article ten’s truth. Nor is the underlying agenda complex, including, for article five, whether God created sin, and if not, its origin – how Satan could have become evil; and, for article ten, why God withheld his grace, allowing first Satan and then Adam to fall, and whether, without grace, they could have remained good. However, the headline statements in the articles open up major issues for Christianity, including grace and freewill, topics also covered in article nine.

Article six

Sextus, quod angelus in eodem instanti potest esse in diversis locis et esse ubique si voluerit.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, credimus enim, quod angelus est in loco per definitionem, ita quod si est hic, non est alibi in eodem instanti; impossibile est enim quod sit ubique, hoc enim proprium est solius Dei.¹⁷

Article six, at first sight, might appear relatively unimportant. There are no significant textual variations. However, the concern is not primarily about angelic movement and location, fascinating though contemporary theologians found this subject, but about the potential effect of angelic omnipresence on God’s omnipotence – only God can be everywhere at once. In Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae* this issue is therefore positioned in the context of God’s nature, not of the discussion on angels.

While angels must not encroach on God’s omnipresence, equally they are not corporeal and so do not suffer the same constraints as humans in motion and location. This gave rise to long discussions about the movement of incorporeal substances, in particular simple ones like angels, where problems, such as that a simple entity cannot move through space because movement involves parts sequentially, arose. On location, two bodies cannot occupy the same space, but a body and incorporeal substance can (as body and soul), and an uncreated spirit (the Holy Spirit) and created spirit (as the soul), so what about two created spirits? Other questions included the proper place of angels, which is in heaven worshipping God, and how they, or a particular aspect of them, can therefore be present on earth. There was also an issue over Christ’s Eucharistic presence on the altar.¹⁸

Whether two angels, or created spirits, can be in different places at the same time was part of this menu of issues, but the one with, perhaps, the most serious implications for God's omnipotence if answered incorrectly.

Article seven

Septimus, quod multe veritates sunt ab eterno, que non sunt Deus.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod una sola veritas sit ab eterno, que est Deus.¹⁹

Article seven contains no significant variations.²⁰ However, there appear to be at least three, possibly four, different issues underlying it. Three are discussed in a quaestio attributed to Alexander of Hales, probably from the second half of the 1230s, *About the eternal truth of things* ('*De veritate eterna rerum*') and is one of a set of questions on the eternity of the world. They contain the actual or approximate wording of the banned proposition. The fourth, least likely, candidate comes in a quodlibet on many truths from eternity attributed to the Dominican Godefrid of Bléneau, probably from the early 1240s. This quodlibet, otherwise, concerns 'stateables' (the second topic in Alexander's quaestio) together with a brief reference to God's knowledge (Alexander's third topic).²¹

Taking the four issues in the order they appear in Alexander's quaestio and in Godefrid's quodlibet, the first two are relatively straightforward. The first concerns mathematical concepts or Platonic ideas (although Alexander does not describe them as such). The quaestio makes a link between truths and mathematical concepts, with Alexander citing Augustine as saying that nothing is more eternal than the nature of a circle. However, the nature of a circle is not God, so there are things from eternity that are not God. Mathematical concepts such as a perfect circle are Platonic ideas, in addition to truth, goodness etc.

The second in Alexander's list, and also discussed by Godefrid, is a logical/grammatical argument on stateables or 'enuntiabilia'. Alexander summarises the issue:

All truth which does not begin to be is uncreated truth; but the truth of this proposition, 'antichrist will exist', never began to be, since it was always true to say 'antichrist will exist', even from eternity, and, if God had said this from eternity, he would have said the truth, therefore this truth is uncreated truth, therefore it is from eternity; but it is not the same as God himself, therefore there are many truths from eternity.

Alexander's third point concerns God's knowledge, and how a perfectly simple God can know multiple things. Part of the underlying issue concerns whether everything in God *is* his essence (i.e. there is only one divine idea, which is identical to God's essence, so he is everything he knows), or instead the ideas are *in* God's mind but not identical to the divine essence. Augustine favoured God

having many ideas (*in* God), while Anselm preferred a single idea (which *is* God). The underlying issue is perhaps best encapsulated in Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, where he appears to follow Augustine:

God's cognition is certainly his essence, and his presence, in which are all things, is his cognition; and yet not all things which are in his presence or cognition should be said to be in his essence. For if this were said, these things would be understood to be of the same essence with him. For that is said to be in God through essence which is the divine essence, which is God. And so God has before himself, in his presence, things which he does not have in his nature.²²

The issue of God's knowledge forms the second limb to Alexander's discussion on stateables which God had 'said' ('dixisset') from eternity: Alexander moves from what God had 'said' to what he 'knew' ('novit') from eternity:

This same thing is clear, since God only knew from eternity what is uncreated and is from eternity; but he knows this truth from eternity, therefore it is an uncreated truth and is from eternity.

The aspect of the third issue which specifically concerns whether what God knows is *in* the divinity is picked up by Godefroid in his brief account, again linked to stateables:

Again: it is one thing to be in the divinity and of that which it is, therefore to be in God is to be in the divinity and of that which it is. Which is nonsense ('nihil').

Article seven appears to address both aspects of the issue: the numerical question whether, given there are clearly multiple ideas of things on earth, God has multiple ideas in his mind/essence when he knows; and the ontological question, whether whatever God knows is *in* his mind/essence or *is* his mind/essence.

The final issue relates to the Trinity and, while not raised by Alexander in his quaestio, is the first issue mentioned in Godefroid's quodlibet. It reproduces half of article seven's wording: that from eternity there are three beings or truths, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. These three are clearly all God, but the wording suggests a multiplicity of truths.

Article eight

Octavus, quod primum nunc et creatio-passio possit non esse creata.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod utrumque et est creatum et creatura.²³

Article eight is the only article where different manuscripts contain variant readings possibly of substantive significance: in every text except the one used in the *CUP*, ‘creator vel’ is added to the condemned proposition, which therefore reads: ‘quod primum nunc (‘the first moment of time’) et creatio-passio (‘creation’ – literally ‘undergoing creation’) non sunt creator vel creatura (‘creator or creature/created thing’), or similar words. The truth then reads: ‘quod primum nunc et creatio-passio est creatura’.

It seems likely the text is corrupt or the paleographical abbreviation used was unclear to the scribe, so he confused the various terms. The *CUP* therefore may well have adhered to its chosen text in the face of all the other manuscripts because the addition of ‘creator vel’ is curious and their preferred text made more sense. However, given the almost universal inclusion of the latter, it cannot be ignored. Simplistically, it appears to deny creation, and thus postulate the eternity of the world, which the truth then denies. However, it implies that some people believed that either, or both, ‘primum nunc’ and ‘creatio-passio’ could have been creators.

There are two different ways to interpret ‘primum nunc’ in the offending proposition if the word ‘creator’ is included. The first assumes it is the mirror image of the truth, which specifies both ‘primum nunc’ and ‘creatio-passio’ as created things. This would imply that ‘primum nunc’ or, as sometimes described, ‘primum instans’, refers to the first moment of temporal time. But it is not clear why anyone holding the proposition needed to deny creative powers to temporal time or creation: contemporary works often discuss whether the first moment of time in this sense and creation were created or always existed, and variations on this theme, but they do not appear to suggest that they were themselves creators, at least in the theological sense of producing something from nothing.²⁴

The second interpretation assumes ‘primum nunc’ is different, and prior, to the beginning of time. This is the way Richard Rufus (†1260), appears to have viewed it.²⁵ On this interpretation, ‘primum nunc’ becomes synonymous with God and thus ‘creator’. It would then also stand for ‘creatio-actio’, again synonymous with God, and thus be integrally linked to ‘creatio-passio’ in the proposition, with the whole sentence a single aberrant statement asserting the eternity of the world without any action by the creator or receipt of action by the created thing. However, under this interpretation, as arguably with article nine below, the truth does not match the proposition – the truth appears to equate ‘primum nunc’ with the beginning of temporal time, or anyway not with God or ‘creatio-actio’, and hence properly to have no creative role.

Given the problematic nature of both these interpretations, and the strong possibility of scribal error, it seems likely the *CUP* text offers the best reading for the article. If so, the offending proposition would simply deny that the first moment of time and *creatio-passio* were created, while the truth would affirm that both were created and that to believe otherwise is forbidden. However, even on this reading, the area covered by article eight remains technically complex. It is not always clear in contemporary discussions on ‘primum nunc’ whether a specific distinction is being made between the first moment and the beginning of time. Discussions often focus more generally on whether time was created or eternal,

for example on whether ‘now’ can exist without time before and after it, and the difference between eternity, perpetuity (usually meaning time beginning but not ending) and temporality. ‘Creatio-passio’ covers the process the world undergoes when being created, and hence its effect, the created world, the opposite to ‘creatio-actio’, the act of creation and hence of its agent, God. But its connotation goes further, implying the passive reception of creation as an on-going process, rather than creation as completed and static. Arguments include the simultaneity of cause and effect, whether a created thing can be temporal if its creator is eternal (there cannot be a creator without something being created), whether an eternal creator entails creation must be an on-going process to avoid change in God and similar points.

The problem underlying the issue of *creatio-passio* is perhaps best encapsulated by Richard Dales’ summary of the third part of Douai, Question 461:

Finally the *opponens* brings up another distinction which will become a commonplace, namely that between creation as an action of the creator, and creation as a passion undergone by the creature. He claims that there must have been some creature to undergo the action. The master’s response points out that no passion corresponds to the act of creation, because God does not require anything on which to act, and thus the *exitus* of the world is nothing other than coming into existence.²⁶

Article nine

Nonus, quod qui habet meliora naturalia, de necessitate plus habebit de gratia et gloria.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod Deus secundum quod praelegit et preordinavit, dabit unicuique gratiam et gloriam.²⁷

Article nine covers the vexed issue of the relationship between a human’s life and conduct on earth and his/her subsequent fate, together with God’s role in this.

The textual variations to the article appear clarificatory only. Overall, however, article nine is curious. First, it is unclear if the article covers angels, or humans, or both. Second, there appears to be a mismatch between the proposition, which refers to natural gifts necessarily entailing greater gifts and glory, and the truth, which is couched in terms of predestination. While these are not necessarily incompatible, the normal counterpart to arguments on predestination is freewill, not natural gifts; and in any case the term ‘necessarily’ in the proposition appears to rule out freewill from the discussion.

There are two main possible interpretations of article nine. It may relate to angelic hierarchies, as developed by pseudo-Dionysius (who divided them into nine ranked orders in three ranked groups with decreasing powers and functions from highest to lowest) – angels higher in the hierarchy as a result of their natural gifts, as gifted to them by God, will occupy higher placement in heaven.

This doctrine, even if acceptable for angels, is problematic if applied to humans. Or it could relate primarily to humans and the relationship between God's natural gifts to each individual and his gifts of grace – can an individual, by good use of his/her natural gifts, earn grace and glory, or is this wholly predetermined by the omniscient and omnipotent God? In either case, 'meliora natura' must refer to those personal traits or endowments created by nature, albeit all nature comes from God. They contrast with 'supernatural' or 'praeternatural' gifts, those granted by God as an act of grace above or beyond natural gifts.

Conclusion

As the preceding summary demonstrates, many, possibly all, of the articles were multi-faceted, with numerous underlying agendas. They covered complex contemporary issues. The analysis provides the basis for Chapters 3 and 4. These chapters assess what influences might have lain behind the condemned propositions – why they were chosen, individually and as a group, and what were the historical, institutional and doctrinal implications of such choices.

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 The *CUP* version serves as the base text. Manuscript variants (those identified by the *CUP* at Appendix A, others as specified in the endnotes) are discussed where significant.
- 2 'The first [error] is, that the divine essence in itself will be seen by neither man nor angel. This error we reprove/condemn, and we excommunicate those asserting and defending it, by the authority of William, the bishop. Moreover, we firmly believe and assert that God in his essence or substance will be seen by the angels and all saints, and is seen by glorified souls.'
- 3 For Augustine's views, see pp. 111–2, n. 152.
- 4 For the equation made by Gregory I (the Great) between essence and nature, see G. Geréby, 'Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 196–7.
- 5 Other variations include Paris, BN., Lat., MS 15820, f. 193ra, which omits the words 'omnibus sanctis et videtur'. Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv, p. 281, omits the same words, but adds 'sanctis' after 'angelis' and replaces 'ab animabus glorificatis' with 'ab homine glorificato'.
- 6 Alexander of Hales (*Glossa*, iii, 23, p. 262), adapting Peter Lombard's discussion on faith, set a trend for discussions on cognition (implicitly including vision), dividing it into three main areas, the subject believing, the object believed in and the medium between: 'Nota quod omnes dubitationes incidentes circa fidem aut incident ex parte credentis, aut ex parte crediti, aut ex parte medii habitus qui est inter credentem et creditum, ...'. These areas were themselves often complex, for example, the distinction between the medium 'by' which and 'through which' an object is known. Moreover, what constitutes a medium is not straightforward. However, albeit writing later than the condemnation, Aquinas resolved one critical issue: he argued that the means by which 'a created intelligence is raised to the intellectual vision of the divine substance

- is called the “light of glory”, and that this light is itself the ‘divine substance’. It does not thus interfere with man’s direct vision of God (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* (*Of God and His Creatures*), trans. J. Rickaby (London, 1905), p. 225, iii. 53).
- 7 C. Trottmann, *La vision béatifique des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Paris, 1995), pp. 5–8, also makes this distinction.
 - 8 A fourth period, that of prelapsarian Adam, falls outside article one’s scope.
 - 9 V. Lossky, *The Vision of God*, trans. A. Moorhouse (Aylesbury, 1973), pp. 9–10.
 - 10 ‘Second, that although the divine essence is one in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, nevertheless that, with respect to form, it is one in the Father and Son, but not one in these with the Holy Spirit, and yet this form is the same as the divine essence. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that the essence or substance is one in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and the essence is the same with respect to form.’
 - 11 ‘Third, that the Holy Spirit, as a bond or love, does not proceed from the Son, but only from the Father. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that as a bond or love, it proceeds from both.’
 - 12 ‘Fourth, that glorified souls are not in the empyrean heaven with the angels, nor will glorified bodies be there, but in the aqueous or crystalline heaven, which is above the firmament; which they also presume to think concerning the blessed Virgin. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that there will be the same corporeal place namely, the empyrean heaven, for angels and sanctified souls and glorified bodies.’
 - 13 William of Auvergne, *De universo* (*Opera omnia*, i), pp. 628, 2H-631, 2C.
 - 14 Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora*, iv, p. 282; Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 9.8 (Borgnet, xxvii), p. 208.
 - 15 ‘Fifth, that the evil angel was bad in the beginning of his creation, and never was anything but evil. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that he was created good, and afterwards through sinning became evil.’
 - 16 ‘Tenth, that the evil angel never had ground whereon he could stand, nor even Adam in his state of innocence. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that each one had the means whereby he could stand, but not whereby he could progress/profit.’
 - 17 ‘Sixth, that an angel in the same instant can be in different places and be everywhere, if he wishes. We reprove/condemn this error, for we believe that an angel is in one defined place/place by definition so that, if he is here, he is not elsewhere in the same instant; for it is impossible that he be everywhere, for this is proper to God alone.’
 - 18 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 37, pp. 364–5: ‘God is properly everywhere, but a pure creature is here or there; but a creature united to the divine nature [i.e. Christ’s human body] is properly in the middle between extremes, wherefore it conforms to the pure creature in one way and the Creator in another. For in what it is to sit at the Father’s right hand in heaven, it conforms to the pure creature, namely in having a determined place. But in what is everywhere sanctified sacramentally, it imitates divine being, because the divine being is everywhere; but it is lacking in this, because the divine being is everywhere, but the being of the body under the sacrament is being in many places ...’. Alexander thus offered a threefold hierarchy: divine being; Christ’s human body; and all creatures, corporeal or incorporeal. Medieval theologians’ concerns over how to explain Christ’s real presence at the altar at the Eucharist could have increased interest in the frequently discussed question of the location of angels (I. Iribarren and M. Lenz, ‘Introduction – The Role of Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry’, in Iribarren and Lenz (eds.), *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry* (Aldershot, 2008), p. 2). For example, if Christ’s true body is in heaven, how could it also be the sacrament on the altar in the Eucharist, since no body can be in more than one place at the same time – see Aquinas, *Summa*, xii, pp. 155–7, 3a.Q.75.a.1.
 - 19 ‘Seventh, that there are many truths from eternity, which are not God. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that there is one truth alone from eternity, which is God.

- 20 The *CUP* (i, p. 172, note 21) notes that all the condemnation's manuscripts add 'and there was no truth from eternity which is not that truth', but it does not include the words, perhaps because their purpose seems merely emphatic. However, they may indicate the level of concern over this proposition and the desire for precision in its articulation.
- 21 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 215–8, 240–3; [Godefroid of Bléneau], 'Quodlibeta Holmensia', ed. F. Stegmüller, *Divus Thomas*, 27 (1949), pp. 211–2; P. Glorieux, '1. Godefroid de Bléneau et son Quodlibet', *RTAM*, 23 (1956), pp. 321–3. Godefroid was Dominican regent master in theology at Paris from 1235–42 (P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1933–4), i, pp. 59–61).
- 22 Augustine, 'Question 46', in *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008), pp. 59–60; Anselm of Canterbury, *Monologion (The Major Works)*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008), pp. 26–8, 52; Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 36.1–5, pp. 197–202.
- 23 'Eighth, that the first now/beginning of time and the creation-passion cannot have been created. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that each is both created and creature.'
- 24 One text possibly containing a vestige of this view comes from Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*: 'Further, there is no medium between the Creator and the creature. But creation is signified as the medium between them both: since it is not the Creator, as it is not eternal; nor is it the creature, because in that case it would be necessary for the same reason to suppose another creation to create it, and so on to infinity. Therefore creation is not anything in the creature' (Aquinas, *Summa*, iv, pp. 466–7, 1a.Q.45.a3).
- 25 Below, pp. 221–2.
- 26 R.C. Dales, *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1990), pp. 54–6; P. Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *RTAM*, 10 (1938), p. 237. The opponent's possibly aberrant view could reflect standard scholastic disputation.
- 27 'Ninth, that he who has greater natural gifts/talents will necessarily have more grace and glory. We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that God will give grace and glory to each one according as he has pre-elected and preordained.'

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Manuscript and archival sources

Paris, BN., Lat., MS 15820.

Printed primary sources

- Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia* ..., ed. A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).
- Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1951–7).
- Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent*, ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome, 2013).
- Anselm of Canterbury, *The Major Works*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008).
- Augustine, *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Miscellany of Eighty-Three Questions; Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician; and, Eight Questions of Dulcitius*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008).

- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- [Godefroid of Bléneau], ‘Quodlibeta Holmensia’, ed. F. Stegmüller, *Divus Thomas*, 27 (1949), pp. 201–22.
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano (4 vols., Toronto, 2007–10).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles (Of God and His Creatures)*, trans., annot., abrid. J. Rickaby (London, 1905).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, in *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita*, cura et studio Fratrum Praedicatorum (50 vols., Rome, 1862), iv–xii.
- William of Auvergne, *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Paris, 1674).

Printed secondary works

- Dales, R.C., *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1990).
- Geréby, G., ‘Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine and Latin Theological Debates: Monarchianism and Crypto-Dyophysitism’, in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 183–211.
- Glorieux, P., ‘1. Godefroid de Bléneau et son Quodlibet’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 23 (1956), pp. 321–3.
- Glorieux, P., ‘Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–52, 225–67.
- Glorieux, P., *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1933–4).
- Iribarren, I., and Lenz, M., ‘Introduction – The Role of Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry’, in Iribarren and Lenz (eds.), *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 1–11.
- Lossky, V., *The Vision of God*, trans. A. Moorhouse (Aylesbury, 1973).
- Trottmann, C., *La vision béatifique des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Rome, 1995).

3 Causes and influences

Overview

To assess its significance, the condemnation needs to be put in its historical, institutional and intellectual context. Here the pope must be the starting point. The pope, as head of the Catholic Church and thus God's representative on earth, had become the supreme authority for Catholic theologians and, indeed, for all Catholic-dominated society. He was theoretically superior even to kings and emperors, with the power to excommunicate, although relations with successive emperors were frequently fraught. For Paris theologians, he was the pinnacle of their world. At the beginning of 1241, Pope Gregory IX, 'sponsor' of the university at Paris, had been besieged in Rome for half a year by the emperor, Frederick II. He was probably over ninety years old and thus in any case reaching the end of his pontificate. Thirteenth-century theologians at Paris had only known a world dominated by continuous papal leadership: first Innocent III (Gregory's uncle, 1198–1216), who had revitalised the papacy and extended its authority; then, with Gregory instrumental in his choice, Honorius III (1216–1227); and finally Gregory himself (1227–1241).¹ The imminent election could have suggested Paris theologians needed to prepare for a new pope, an opportunity to express their influence and authority, which the subsequent vacancy only served to reinforce. By 1244 Innocent IV (1243–1254), had been pope for under a year, following Celestine IV's sixteen-day papacy at the end of 1241 and a subsequent interregnum. Individually and collectively, theologians at Paris might have wanted to make a timely public statement of their orthodoxy on key doctrinal points. It is notable that Odo of Châteauroux, chancellor of the university, gained promotion to cardinal in 1244, and others with strong links to the university, such as the Dominican Hugh of St.-Cher, were similarly favoured the same year.

Such ambitions remain a matter of speculation. But the condemnation's immediate historical context is important. The period starting with Lateran IV, November 1215, with its statement of faith a defining moment for Catholic doctrine and a triumph for papal ambitions, and finishing with the condemnation in 1241/4, is crucial. Its challenges profoundly affected theologians at the university. Organisationally, this generation saw the development of a university, including its admission of the new mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans.

Political and doctrinal threats included heresy, a concern only really diminishing with the fall of Montségur in 1244 following a siege by the French royal forces, but also drawing in unease over Jewish ‘aberrance’, with the Talmud put on trial in the early 1240s in Paris at the pope’s behest.² This was linked with increasing apprehension over new philosophical learning from the south and east and, perhaps, also with the continuing impasse with the Greek Church, both over its independence from the pope and its substantive doctrinal differences. More indirect concerns contributing to insecurity included the dispute with Frederick II, with Frederick’s openly aggressive actions in 1240 taking this to a new level.³ There was a threat from the Mongols, at its peak with their invasion of Hungary in 1241, and concerns over other groups, including the Muslims. Latin territories in the east, and Constantinople itself, remained at risk, and crusades, such as the failed fifth crusade in 1217–21 and the disastrous 1239 Syrian expedition, continued.⁴ Apocalyptic speculation was rife, including on the possible role of some groups, in particular Jews, Muslims and Mongols, with Frederick II himself painted by Gregory IX as the forerunner of the Antichrist.⁵ This was potentially a toxic mix.

If the principles of Catholic doctrine had themselves been incontrovertibly entrenched, with their proper interpretation established, Paris theologians might have been able to view such challenges as external and largely irrelevant to their studies and been confident in their developing roles as preachers and evangelists without the need for internal regulatory action. But the Bible itself contained apparently contradictory statements, such as on the vision of God, and unfathomable mysteries, such as the Trinity; and different views within the Latin tradition itself persisted in the thirteenth century. Some may have stemmed from uncertainties inherited from Augustine’s works, with his often-changing views and doctrinal struggles, while others came from disagreements from ninth-century scholars onwards, most notably Eriugena, with his *Periphyseon* banned but still read in the thirteenth century, and twelfth-century theologians, of whom Gilbert of Poitiers was perhaps the most relevant to the condemnation. These earlier Latin writers were themselves influenced – often inspired – by non-Christian or non-Catholic doctrines, especially from the ancient Greek philosophers and Greek Fathers, but their works were internal to the Latin theology and left an unstable basis which could have been seen by thirteenth-century theologians at Paris as vulnerable to subversion or attack.

This chapter looks at two areas from c.1215 to c.1244, which could have shaped the condemnation – institutional developments and then doctrinal influences – and on which, conversely, the condemnation itself can provide fresh insight. The starting point for both areas is the statement of faith from Lateran IV, the first such major declaration of core principles issued by the Catholic Church since the ecumenical rulings of the fourth- and fifth-century Christological controversies.⁶ The statement had more than just doctrinal significance. There was also a political context, both diplomatic and ecclesiastical, given the contemporary difficulties with the Greeks (where Innocent III and his successors were ever more determined to exert papal sovereignty and that of Catholic dogma following the Latin conquest of Byzantium in 1204), and the Cathars (who the church claimed

posed a threat not merely doctrinally but also to its very organisation).⁷ Lateran IV represented the culmination of Innocent III's pontificate, and reflected much of the reform agenda of the Paris theologian and chanter of Notre Dame, Peter the Chanter (†1197), and his circle at Paris, with the statutory incorporation of a university of teaching masters at Paris shortly before, in August 1215, showing the same concern for reform. It represented a major milestone for both the church and the emerging university and a crucial reference point for theology up to the condemnation and beyond.⁸ Together with the university statutes, it shaped the developing institution of the university at Paris and its faculty of theology.

However, despite its authority as official Catholic doctrine, Lateran IV did not put an end to the controversies it was intended to address, and the issues covered by its statement of faith surfaced again in the condemnation of 1241/4. Explanations for why they did so, why some theologians at Paris held views counter to the emerging orthodoxy – or indeed why, if in some cases no Paris theologian appears to have done so, they were nevertheless included in the condemnation – and why these specific ten articles were singled out, must lie in this period from 1215 onwards, which shaped the doctrines, aspirations and fears of Paris theologians in the early 1240s. The condemnation did not come out of nothing: it had its own historical context, and should not simply be judged in the shadow of subsequent events.⁹

Institutional influences

The role of Paris theologians: the university statutes and Lateran IV

The period from c.1215 to c.1244 saw major institutional developments which had a significant impact on the way theologians at Paris saw their role. Recent scholarship has highlighted the late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century reform agenda of Peter the Chanter and his circle accompanying these. While there were variations in the detail of both the criticisms and proposals of the different groups in this period, the need to reform the schools in order better to support church and society was a belief shared by all. This view shaped the first statutes for the university, prescribed by the papal legate, Robert of Courçon, previously a student under Peter the Chanter, and subsequently remained influential. The statutes were based on the belief that morality was essential to theology and its intellectual pursuit – a major and important change from the climate of the twelfth-century schools. They comprised a 'special mandate ('speciale mandatum')' from the pope for their reform.¹⁰ This demonstrated the pope's interest in the well-being of theologians at Paris and implied he saw them as important to the church. It must have spurred them to assert a preeminent place in leading theology in the church and to accept the need for self-regulation, high moral standards and discipline.¹¹ This change formed the context for the events of 1241/44.

Peter the Chanter's approach to theology had been practical, with a particular focus on moral and pastoral care. He and his colleagues set out specific advice for the three categories of reading, disputation and preaching which had been

identified as the proper functions of theologians and which formed the main teaching methods in the schools. For example, in his *Verbum abbreviatum*, he advised on disputations, advocating a collective approach. His school's standpoint, while not condemning Greek philosophers, can be seen as reflecting the growing separation of theology from philosophy at the university – accordingly, the group believed concepts such as the Trinity could only be approached by excluding human reason and philosophical concepts.¹² Such an outlook was thus ingrained in the developing university from the start and formed an important part of the condemnation's frame of reference.

Four voices are of particular interest, given their roles, then or later, as chancellors of the university. Peter of Poitiers (chancellor 1193–1205) argued that studying the scriptures by themselves was insufficient: 'one must also demonstrate knowledge in the fruit of good works'. His successor, Praepositinus of Cremona (chancellor 1206–9), complained that those studying in monasteries and schools 'study that they might know, that they might be known ... not that they might be edified or edify others'. In his early poems, Philip the Chancellor (chancellor 1217–36) protested that students saw riches as more important than learning, with teaching methods corrupt. Finally, Odo of Châteauroux (chancellor 1238–44), in a sermon delivered probably c.1235–7, stated that the doctors and preachers ('doctores et predicatores'), the holy and learned men ('sancti viri and litterati'), now illuminated the whole world much more than previously.¹³ Expectation of the role of theologians at Paris is reflected in a letter from Innocent III in 1205 to the masters and scholars at Paris, asking them to go to Constantinople to reform its university ('litterarum studium').¹⁴ Domestically, Lateran IV, canon eleven, stipulated the appointment of a master in every cathedral church, and other churches, to teach clerics and poor students for free. Paris theologians were thus clearly expected to spread their learning more widely, a message repeated in the dispatch of Paris theologians to Toulouse in 1217 to help deal with what was viewed as a hotbed of heresy.¹⁵

Following the 1215 university statutes, the religious orders' entry to the university, particularly that of the Dominicans and Franciscans, marked a further important change. The papacy relied on them increasingly in areas such as debates with the Greek Church, and they had a clear and growing external focus as doctrinal experts and papal enforcers. Those involved included Paris-educated theologians. Leaving aside the hostility the orders evoked in the university, anyway, later in the 1250s, such developments must have affected how the masters, including the seculars, viewed their role corporately – at the very least, the role given to the orders by the pope is likely to have increased the reputation and importance of the faculty in which they studied in the eyes of the church and hence, very probably, their own. Moreover, being masters together in the theology faculty probably helped both to ensure the secular theologians at the university were informed about issues outside their curriculum and to foster the external focus that the earlier reformers desired.

However, the role the masters embraced of leading theology was not a passive one. Leading theology meant shaping it, both intellectually and for the church.

Given the central importance of the church for all aspects of life, the way the masters did this would have had an effect on all sections of society. Their concerns were not limited to abstruse areas such as the composition of the Trinity, but extended to mundane issues with a major impact on people's lives, such as marital problems, trade and usury, and the seven deadly sins. Such moral or ethical topics formed the subject of sermons, and could lead to requests for advice from lay groups outside the university.¹⁶ The masters appear increasingly to have attempted to formalise theological positions and make them coherent, arguably not merely their own but those of the groups with whom they came into contact, as may have been the case with doctrines viewed as heretical – indeed, such formalisation could have itself served to shape or even inadvertently influence such doctrines.¹⁷

Dominicans and Franciscans

Dominicans and Franciscans played an increasingly important role in the university at Paris. They were present in their own *studia* from 1217 and 1220 respectively, and gained a first (Dominican) chair in the theology faculty in May 1229, with the Dominicans acquiring a second and the Franciscans a single chair in the 1230s. This step was significant for both the university and the orders. For the university, it brought into its fold or retained some of the period's most eminent theologians, with major figures, such as Alexander of Hales, joining the friars while keeping his theology chair. For the orders, it put them at the centre of theological doctrine, cementing their place in its development and promulgation. The move was probably supported by Gregory IX and, given his patronage and use of the friars, may have drawn him closer to the university itself.

Both orders were, by design, outward-facing.¹⁸ Successive popes built on the orders' missions to deliver their shared agenda, with Gregory IX relying on them particularly heavily. The Franciscans led debates between the Latin and Greek Churches in 1231/4. Areas where Gregory gave the Dominicans responsibility included monastic reform in the late 1220s; and, in the 1230s, he appointed three Dominican bishops – for Toulouse; Bosnia (mandated to suppress heresy and assert papal supremacy); and the Scottish west highlands. The extent of Gregory's use of the orders can be seen in his correspondence, with numerous letters to both orders related to heresy, negotiations with the Greek Church, expeditions to the Holy Land and conversion of pagans over a wide sweep of territory.¹⁹

The role of the Dominicans in the emerging Inquisition is particularly notable. Dominic probably helped Gregory before he became pope to tackle Italian heretics. He gave his order a principal aim to fight Catharism in France. The Dominicans led the developing Inquisition and promulgated and helped to organise some crusades. The order's origins lay in combatting heresy in Toulouse, and their inquisitorial role kept them firmly at the centre of this battle – thus, as a result of the order's presence in Paris, Catharism must have been a major topic there.²⁰ Moreover, Roland of Cremona, the first Dominican-trained theology master at Paris, moved to Toulouse in 1229; and Raymond of

Peñaafort, Dominican Master General 1238–40, was influential in establishing the Inquisition in Aragon.²¹

However, the relationship between the mendicant orders and the university was not straightforward. First, while advanced mendicant students studied theology at the university and both orders had masters there, the majority of their education was separate, with none studying in the arts faculty, and most of those studying at the university were not expected to finish their degrees. The Dominican school of St.-Jacques existed before 1220, when it was authorised as a ‘studium’.²² Second, despite the linkage of the Dominican ‘studium’ with the university soon after afterwards, Dominicans, and also Franciscans, studying at the university had different affiliations from its other members.²³ Nevertheless, while their organisations’ roles differed, they seem to have worked together with a common purpose in 1241/4; and indeed some, such as Alexander of Hales, given his late move to the Franciscans when around fifty years old, must have understood and perhaps shared the perceptions of both groups. Members of both orders were implicated in the condemnation.

The pope

Papal involvement in the schools of Paris had been an intermittent feature of the twelfth century. Gregory IX, however, seems to have shown a particularly close concern, with his pontificate covering the critical years preceding the condemnation.²⁴

In assessing any papal influence on the condemnation, an important question is how far Gregory involved himself in doctrinal details and communicated his views to theologians at Paris within the overall context of his pontificate’s preoccupations – which included throughout, and especially by the time of the final hostilities from 1239, the escalating dispute with Frederick II, as well as the spread of heresy, the conflict with the Greeks, the crusades and the broad question of church reform. The evidence comes primarily from the collections of letters, papal bulls and other documents from Gregory’s pontificate, although it is difficult to be sure which emanated directly from the pope and which from his cardinals or curia. However, as he was responsible for the direction of these bodies, the documents should demonstrate Gregory’s priorities reasonably accurately.²⁵ Indeed, all documents in his name would presumably be seen by their recipients as his.

Moreover, Gregory’s personal hand can be seen in several areas, especially in his dealings with the university at Paris – for example, when approached by him in 1228, he ordained William of Auvergne and simultaneously elevated him to the bishopric of Paris, a position of some authority over the university.²⁶ He remained closely involved in university affairs throughout his pontificate, for example in the 1229–31 university dispute with the civil authorities and consequent strike, when he described the ‘*studium... litterarum*’ as one ‘by which ... the paradise of the general church is watered and nourished’; and exhorted Louis IX and his mother, Blanche of Castille, to intervene.²⁷ With its return to normality in 1231, his bull, *Parens scientiarum*, gave the university a clearer status, with metaphors

concerning the armour of Christian welfare, suggesting he saw the theologians' role as his spiritual warriors fighting for Christianity. Gregory also wrote to Louis IX in 1231 and 1233 to renew various privileges. Moreover, he took a close interest in the university's administration. *Parens scientiarum* included delegated powers for the masters to organise lectures, academic dress, funerals etc. Not everything was new but, combined with the doctrinal measures it contained, *Parens scientiarum* clearly demonstrated Gregory's ambitions for the university and its theologians.²⁸

A letter in 1237 from Gregory to the abbot and Augustinian community of St. Victor also illuminates his vision for the university, recording his agreement to their request for a theology master '... to expedite the salvation of ... [their] souls and the souls of others; and because ... [their] brothers, to whom Parisian students often make their way ... to receive penance ... are often required to dispense the nourishment of the word of God, in ... churches which pertain to ... [their] monastery...'.²⁹ This letter demonstrates Gregory's concern for the religious orders, with his agreement to a theology master part of his mission to improve education in monasteries and other such communities. It makes explicit Gregory's belief that theologians from the university at Paris should be utilised for pastoral training outside.³⁰

Gregory's relationship with the religious orders also demonstrated his zeal for church reform and belief in his papal responsibilities. His close relationship with both the Dominican and Franciscan orders from his period as a cardinal was notable, and he was a personal friend to both their founders, supporting their work, utilising their outward-facing missions and, for the Franciscans, helping them to reorganise themselves after Francis' death. But he was also involved in reforming the traditional orders to a greater degree than his predecessors. For example, he issued statutes reforming the Benedictines and Premonstratensians in the 1230s. He also reformed the Victorines, though not by statute.³¹

Gregory's decretal collection, published and with a copy sent to the university at Paris in 1234, further demonstrated his commitment to reform, together with his vision of the church's role and his own as its leader. This collection was a landmark – with its papal authority it was the definitive and obligatory collection of canon law for the whole church, covering almost every aspect of life. Significantly, it began with the statement of faith from Lateran IV, demonstrating its continued importance and centrality.³²

Taken together, these reforming initiatives demonstrate Gregory's ambitions for the church and his regulation of roles within it, as part of a forceful, single-minded and comprehensive plan for its supremacy over ecclesiastical affairs and beyond. The duties of theologians at Paris within his scheme, and their relationship with other bodies, were clear. Gregory had plainly established his remit for Paris theologians – to have and disseminate a clear, cogent, message, conforming to Lateran IV's principles, within and outside the church.

Gregory's actions also demonstrate his concerns over the risks to Christian doctrine from outside contamination, and, as head of the church, his views must have influenced the outlook of Paris theologians. His swift action in 1239 over

complaints made by Nicholas Donin, a Jewish convert to Christianity, against the Talmud and other Jewish books, involving the Paris theology masters, exemplifies this.³³ Moreover, Gregory consistently and vehemently opposed heresy both before and during his papacy. His 1221 legations to Italy included action against heresy in Mantua, Piacenza and Bergamo – they complemented his early friendship with Dominic, active against heresy in Toulouse. His experiences, in particular the difficulty of tackling heresy in Italian towns on a local basis, could well have contributed to his decision to establish a centrally based Inquisition, independent of local interests.³⁴ This may be dated to April 1227, when Gregory upbraided the Lombard and Tuscan cities, in particular Florence, over failures to act, accusing them of making ‘your statutes about expelling heretics ... and carrying out these statutes superficially, you banish these heretics, and they return after a brief time ...’. He ordered them to adopt Lateran IV’s canons on heresy. Crucially, he entrusted the commission to Dominican leadership rather than to the local bishop.³⁵

However, the question remains: how far did Gregory dictate doctrinal detail rather than overall direction, and hence were those imposing the condemnation primarily aiming to reflect his specific views? One important question is his attitude to the new Aristotelian and related texts. A letter from Gregory to Frederick II, in 1227, may illustrate his approach, with Gregory mixing biblical references with concepts drawn from Avicenna.³⁶ This suggests Gregory was happy to use philosophical works when it suited him.³⁷ It is supported by a letter he wrote, in 1227, to Stephen Langton, asking him, following Pope Honorius III’s earlier request, to confer a benefice on Michael Scot, expert in Hebrew and Arabic. The reference to Michael’s linguistic prowess demonstrates Gregory wanted his translation work to continue.³⁸

Gregory’s *Pars scientiarum* also demonstrated his attitude to the new learning, although different interpretations are possible. The bull dealt separately with the arts and theology faculties. For the arts, it decreed the books on nature forbidden by the 1210 Sens Council should not be read at Paris publicly or privately until examined and purged of all errors.³⁹ Following this, Gregory wrote to ‘Magistris W. archidiacono Belvacensi, ...’ (‘Guillemo’ in the heading, probably the Paris theology master, William of Auxerre, †1231) and two canons, requiring them to examine the books at their discretion, since they were said to contain both useful (‘utilia’) and useless things (‘inutilia’), so that the useless should not spoil the useful, and to remove any errors, scandalous or legally offensive material found so that the rest could be studied safely.⁴⁰ The choice of William, who actively used Aristotle to contribute to theological understanding but subordinated to it, suggests Gregory was open-minded. A further letter to the abbot of St. Victor and to the prior of the Dominicans at Paris absolving those scholars and masters disobeying the 1210 injunction supports this.⁴¹ Gregory addressed the theologians differently. He stipulated that the masters and scholars of theology should endeavour to act in a praiseworthy manner, and not to show themselves as philosophers (‘philosophos’) but strive to become learned theologians (‘theodocti’), and not speak in the popular language nor confound the Hebrew vernacular with

the Azotic ('Azotica', i.e. profane or common language), but only dispute in the schools over those questions which could be decided by theological books ('libros theologicos') and the treatises of the holy fathers ('sanctorum patrum tractatus').⁴²

Luca Bianchi comments that Gregory's promise that Aristotle's books on physics and metaphysics could be studied in the arts faculty was a first step to all his works being authorised in 1255. He argues Gregory, unable to distinguish between the valuable and dangerous in the texts, genuinely wanted cuts to render them a 'kind of anthology of "sound" doctrines'. However, he believes Gregory's hasty treatment of the arts faculty, with an inquiry which was never followed up, suggests Gregory's main interest was the theology faculty. He argues: 'Even the regulations concerning the *libri naturales*, though overtly addressed to the arts masters, paradoxically conveyed a message above all to theologians: guaranteeing the *future* monopoly of Aristotelian texts to the arts faculty was ... the best way to prevent ... any attempt to introduce some of them into the theological curriculum'.⁴³

Ensuring the theology faculty's primacy and purity was clearly Gregory's main interest. However, exactly how he thought the theologians should treat philosophical works is questionable. The 1210 and 1215 bans left private study untouched – the concern was these books' subservience to theology and exposure to those less capable of understanding them. Moreover, all theologians outside the religious orders graduated through the arts faculty and thus, once permitted as Gregory planned, they would have studied Aristotle's works, albeit expurgated. Arguably, therefore, Gregory intended an incremental learning process, with everyone mastering and using Aristotle's works, but with the theologians specifically enjoined to subordinate them to theology.

However, after *Parens scientiarum*, Gregory appeared to keep his attention more focused on university administration, law and order, and the rights of the university against the bishop in particular, than on the substance of theology actually taught. Moreover, even in 1231 and earlier, his focus was on the curriculum and permitted texts, not doctrine. The collection of letters in *Bullarium Franciscanum*, while demonstrating Gregory's major use of the mendicant orders, contains no detailed theological doctrine, although the topics for discussion, for example with the Greeks, were theological, and the battle against heresy was conducted, anyway ostensibly, on theological grounds. No evidence of papal concern over exactly what the friars preached is discernible.⁴⁴ But against this, the friars must have gone out with a clear knowledge of their negotiating position, which must have at least been agreed by the papacy.

Again, the documents in *Sacrorum Conciliorum*, a huge collection relating primarily, but not exclusively, to church councils, demonstrate the large amount of activity taking place against heretics, particularly the Albigensians but more widely, with a smaller number on the Greek Church. The numerous entries demonstrate the level of papal concern. As would be expected, given the precedents of Lateran III and IV with their attention to the details of various heresies and Lateran IV's statement of faith, the documents in this collection showed attention to theological doctrine in the context of the various heresies and the Greek Church.⁴⁵

However, they appear limited to issues arising in these two contexts. Or, putting this another way, they provide evidence of involvement in doctrinal issues where there was a challenge to Catholic doctrine from outside mainstream church orthodoxy, but not of involvement in other areas of doctrine not externally challenged.

Similarly, taking the four volumes of the registers of Gregory IX, with their 6,183 documents from his papacy, the entries demonstrating papal interest in either the university at Paris or theological issues were a tiny proportion of the total and did not deal with theological issues as such, but rather administrative or judicial issues related to theological learning.⁴⁶ More generally, however, the registers provide clear evidence that Gregory's interest in Paris, both in the university and more widely, was comparatively strong. Paris receives around 350 entries, some of them duplicates, contrasting with only nine for Oxford and six for Bologna, with none for either university. The only 'studia' apart from Paris with even a handful of entries are those at Vercelli, Piedmont and Toulouse – indeed, despite Gregory's interest in the university there for combatting heresy, only nine entries are recorded for Toulouse.⁴⁷ The most important conclusion to be drawn from the registers, therefore, may be the importance Gregory attached to Paris and all things connected to it – the comparatively large number of entries demonstrates the pope saw the role of Paris and its university in a special, and especially important, light.

This reliance on Paris must have had consequences in terms of papal interest in theological doctrines being developed there – it would be odd if the pope had been content to depend on the university for those he wanted to teach theology to others and spread the gospel, had he not been satisfied that their views were proper. But evidence of direct doctrinal interference, beyond the issue of new Aristotelian texts, is lacking.⁴⁸ However, Gregory's prompt despatch in 1234 of his decretals to the university, and his order to comply with them, is notable, demonstrating the importance he attached both to their contents and to the university. Moreover, it is clear the university was relevant in other key areas of papal policy, both on its own account and through the strong mendicant presence there. Gregory's interest in clerical education was strong, and the documents demonstrate he saw the university at Paris as crucial for these purposes. He was passionate in combatting heresy and proselytising, aided by the mendicants, some of whom attended the university. For this, he needed to ensure a unanimous clear position on key church doctrines, exactly what the condemnation was in the business of delivering.

Conclusion

The study of theology was not simply an academic pursuit. Theologians had to use their knowledge for the good of the community, whether through preaching or fighting heresy and aberrant beliefs. This was not an optional part of their role. This external perspective is an important context for the condemnation. As regards Gregory's papacy, my examination of the documents has not revealed an identifiable link with the content of the condemnation's articles. But the evidence demonstrates Gregory's mission for the university and the theology masters

within it in delivering proper theological doctrine according to Lateran IV's principles. It shows the proselytising zeal of the papacy for which a clear doctrinal position would be required, the need for properly educated and motivated personnel to spread this, and the use of the mendicant orders to achieve this aim. It is against this background that Gregory's position in respect of the condemnation must be viewed.

Taken as a whole, the relevance of the institutional influences appears to be more in the timing and overall purpose of the condemnation than in the detailed content of the individual articles. The theology faculty was emerging as a self-conscious, ambitious body with a belief in its importance in determining doctrine and its external role. While the pope shared many of the concerns underlying the articles, and could have prompted action on some, his importance lay primarily in his vision for theologians at Paris and their role. The condemnation was the first to address a range of doctrines – in a similar way to the start of Lateran IV (and the opening of Gregory's *Decretals*) – rather than those of specific individuals. For the university at Paris, both instruments formed key parts of historical and institutional developments of the time.

Doctrinal influences

In contrast, specific doctrinal influences primarily affected the detailed formulation of the individual articles and the underlying issues which needed resolution – although they could also have affected the timing and precise coverage of the overall 'package' of articles this book postulates. This is especially the case with concerns over Greek, Cathar and Jewish beliefs which, whether or not they had any direct influence on it, formed part of the context for the condemnation. The analysis below concentrates on the theologians/philosophers and the doctrines or specific texts which may underlie the propositions to which the condemnation objected. Chapter 4 then analyses the sources used by theologians contemporary to the condemnation in their analysis of the areas it covered. Finally, Appendix B contains the texts by contemporary theologians which appear actually to advocate the offending propositions.

While many of the influences were largely external – as from heresy and the new Aristotelian texts – they were also all inter-related. However, the starting point must be the attempts within the Latin tradition itself to make sense of abstruse and sometimes apparently contradictory biblical passages, together with the explanations, often confusing and sometimes conflicting, which had been offered by the patristic authorities.

Lateran IV and the Latin tradition

Lateran IV

As well as its institutional significance, Lateran IV's statement of faith (canon one) established the tenets of Christian faith before using these as a measure for

other doctrines it condemned as heresies or approved. Canon two started ‘We therefore (*‘ergo’*) condemn and reprove...’, thus referring back to the earlier principles. Canon one itself contained succinct but comprehensive summaries of key Catholic beliefs – the ‘one true’ God and the Trinity, angels and creation, the origin of sin, Christ’s incarnation and role, Judgment Day, and the church and sacraments.⁴⁹

A comparison of Lateran IV with the articles of the condemnation demonstrates the close relationship between the two. Article two reflected Lateran IV’s initial statement on ‘three persons but one simple essence ...’, and, while article one was not directly reflected, the reference to God’s ‘incomprehensible and ineffable nature’ formed part of theological arguments on the beatific vision.⁵⁰ Lateran IV’s next statement provided for the dual procession – the subject of article three – followed by God as the one principle of all things (relevant to article seven on eternal truths) and the creator of all things from nothing (article eight). Reference to the devil and other demons being created good followed (article five), together with mankind’s sin at Satan’s prompting (article ten), with article nine (on grace and glory) arguably connected to this. Article six, angelic location, reflected the idea of God’s unique properties, contained in Lateran IV’s opening passage. Only article four, the empyrean heaven, was not foreshadowed in the first part of the statement, but heaven’s creation was implicitly part of the creation of all things spiritual and corporeal. Thus, either directly or indirectly, all ten of the condemnation’s articles were contained in canon one of Lateran IV, covering all its first section.⁵¹

Canon two provided some of the context for the statement of faith. This singled out Joachim of Fiore’s Trinitarian views for detailed censure and endorsed Peter Lombard’s position. While it did not refer explicitly to Gilbert of Poitiers, Gilbert was Peter’s original opponent and the issues discussed in canon two were those on which they disagreed. Canon two concluded with a total condemnation of Amaury of Bène’s views (for which Eriugena was believed to have been responsible). Both Gilbert and Eriugena were being read in Paris after as well as before Lateran IV and their doctrines may well therefore underlie some of the condemnation’s articles as well as those of Lateran IV itself.⁵²

Eriugena (†877)

Many of the issues which surfaced in the condemnation dated from the fourth century onwards. The views condemned as heretical by the early church put forward by the Alexandrian priest Arius (†336) – for whom, in summary, Christ was two persons, and the priest Sabellius (fl. c.220) – for whom the persons of the Trinity were the different faces of God, both indirectly relevant to article two, were still being discussed and refuted in the thirteenth century. The position was similar for inter-Trinitarian relationships generally (articles two and three); predestination (article nine), where the views of the monk Pelagius (†418), who believed in freewill and the essential goodness of human nature, were bitterly opposed by Augustine; the beatific vision (article one), where Augustine’s views were not

wholly clear and could be interpreted in different ways; and dualist views, in particular those attributed to the eastern philosopher Mani (†c.274), whose sect, the Manichaeans, Augustine once joined and then vehemently rejected and actively opposed.⁵³

However, while such views from the third and fourth centuries were still being discussed and the issues within them still raised intractable problems for Christianity, in themselves they seem unlikely to have generated the need for a fresh condemnation in the 1240s, had new debate not kept them in the frame. Such a need more probably resulted from the works and teachings of twelfth- and thirteenth-century theologians, together with those subject to specific censure in the decades preceding the condemnation. The thirteenth-century condemnation of Eriugena's *Periphyseon*, if first imposed in 1225 by Pope Honorius III, post-dated Lateran IV, but its link with the pantheism of Amaury of Bène, whose initial censure pre-dated it, and its continuing influence from the ninth century onwards – coupled with references to Odo of Châteauroux in the context of its banning – make it particularly significant for both Lateran IV and the 1241/4 condemnation.⁵⁴ The comprehensive nature of its ban in 1225 demonstrates the level of threat it was believed to pose. In his letter to the archbishops and other prelates of the churches banning all reading of the text, Honorius stated that the bishop of Paris had notified him about 'a certain book, entitled the *Perifisis*, found all swarming with the maggots of depraved heresy'. It had therefore been condemned 'by a just judgment by our venerable archbishop of Sens and his suffragan bishops gathered together in the provincial council'. Honorius continued:

Wherefore that same book ... is held in some monasteries and other places, and monks and schoolmen ('viri scolastici'), perhaps loving novelty ('novitatum') more than is profitable, occupy themselves rather studiously with the said book, thinking it glorious to display its strange/ignorant ('ignotas') opinions, although the apostle teaches [us] to avoid profane novelties; we ... busy to resist the corrupting influence which a book of this kind can engender, order you individually and collectively ... to search everywhere for that book diligently, and whenever it turns out that the book itself or part of it is to be found, you send it to us without delay ... to be ... burned, or otherwise you yourself publically burn [it] ...; very expressly enjoining that whoever of those ones [monks or schoolmen] has or can have in all or in part examples of the same book, should not delay handing them over to you, by bringing forth a sentence of excommunication against all who presume to retain knowingly that whole book or part of it ...; and giving notice to the same people that, if at any time they have been legally found guilty to have incurred this sentence, they will not evade the brand of heretical depravity.⁵⁵

Honorius clearly felt extremely strongly on the issue: to ensure that the *Periphyseon* could 'be recognised by those who happen upon it', he concluded by noting its division 'into five parts', giving the opening and closing words of each.⁵⁶ While the letter stated that the *Periphyseon* was banned previously, it is clear that, if so,

this had been widely ignored. Indeed, even later, it was clearly still in use, although now a dangerous text to know.⁵⁷

The exact sequence – and number – of thirteenth-century condemnations of the *Periphyseon* and linkages between it and Amaury's doctrines is confused. The primary witness we have to a link between the *Periphyseon* and the Amalricians is Cardinal Henry Hostiensis (†1271), an expert in Roman and canon law, who was recorded in the *Apparatus in Decretali Gregorii I*, c.1260, as having 'found that the doctrine of the impious Amaury is assembled in Master Johannes Scottus' book called *Periphyseon*, that is, about nature'. Lateran IV and other contemporary texts give no substantial detail on Amaury's beliefs, so Henry is a main source for these. He correctly noted that Eriugena was reported 'in the same book to have introduced the authority of the Greek master called Maximus [the Confessor, †662] ('magistri greci nomine Maxime')', suggesting his source had actually read the work.⁵⁸ He continued:

Many heresies are contained in this book, which was also condemned through the masters at Paris ('per magistros damnatus fuit Parisius'), three from which are sufficient as examples.⁵⁹

Henry concluded:

Our venerable father Odo, bishop of Toulouse [Odo of Châteauroux], from whom we had this doctrine ('a quo et habuimus hanc doctrinam'), exposed the said book by condemning particular/several errors ('errores singulos').⁶⁰

The reference to Odo in these terms, and following the reference to being condemned by Paris masters, not the pope (as in 1225) or bishop (as possibly in 1210), is particularly intriguing, given Odo's role in the 1241/4 condemnation. The picture is confused, but, given the linked references, the 1241/4 condemnation itself must be a strong candidate for Odo's 'exposure' of Eriugena's 'errors'.⁶¹

Eriugena's doctrines were heavily influenced by Neoplatonism and the Greek Fathers.⁶² Three in particular were relevant to the 1241/4 condemnation. On the beatific vision (article one), Eriugena was adamant that this would never be seen by humans or angels. He stated: 'The Divine Essence is in itself comprehensible to no bodily sense, to no reason, to no intellect, whether of man or angel'. He continued, in an important passage, first referring to Maximus the Confessor and then claiming Augustine's support:

Augustine [*De civitate Dei*, xxii, 29] says: "Through the bodies that we shall (have) put on, in every body we see wherever we turn the eyes of our body, we shall contemplate with translucent clarity God Himself". Note the sense of the words. For he did not say, "Through the bodies that we shall (have) put on we shall contemplate God Himself" (for in Himself He cannot be seen); but he said: "Through the bodies that we shall (have) put on, in every body we see, we shall contemplate God Himself". Therefore, it is through bodies

in bodies, not through Himself, that He shall be seen. Similarly, it is through intellect in intellects, through reason in reasons, not through itself, that the Divine Essence shall appear.⁶³

Eriugena also identified God's infinity as a bar to our seeing him, asking 'how can the infinite be defined by itself in anything or be understood in anything when it knows itself (to be) above every finite (thing) and every infinite (thing) and beyond finitude and infinity'. He therefore interpreted 'Upon whom the angels desire to gaze' (1.Pt. i:12) as expressing unfulfilled longing for both humans and angels.⁶⁴

Second, Eriugena's position on the Trinity (article two) was complex and could have caused concern, and his denial of the dual procession would certainly have contravened article three. He argued that the Holy Spirit was co-essential with the Father and Son in divinity and subsisted essentially in the nature of both, since he proceeded as substance ('substantialiter') from the Father through the Son. According to Eriugena, there were three substantial causes in one and one in three; and, given the Father was the cause of the other two, there was one preceding cause in the universal cause and the Father was thus the cause of causes. A long discussion of the dual procession followed. Eriugena argued strongly against this, while trying at the same time to accommodate the Latin position and the Nicene Creed. He questioned whether true faith could believe that the Son was born from one cause but the Holy Spirit proceeded from two, arguing that the one Holy Spirit could not have two causes. However, he held this conformed to Catholic faith, because the Father was wholly in the whole of the Son and vice versa. On why the Son was not said to proceed through the Spirit (given his conception through the Holy Spirit), he concluded that the Greek version of the Creed avoided the problems of the Latin one. However, he believed the Latin Fathers who inserted 'who proceeds from the Father and the Son' could reply reasonably ('rationaliter').⁶⁵ But despite this, his discussion and conclusions on the Trinity clearly followed the Greek position and were incompatible with Latin theology.

Finally, Eriugena's arguments conflicted with the condemnation on the subject of eternal truths (article seven) and, indirectly, article eight (creation). He asserted the existence of primordial causes and identified them explicitly with 'ideas' as found in Plato, holding that they were 'eternal species or forms and immutable reasons after which and in which the visible and invisible world is formed and governed'. He argued:

The things that are to be have been made in them before the ages, and therefore they are said to be the principles of all things because all things ... subsist by participation in them, while they themselves are participations of the one Cause of all things, ... [the] Trinity.

Eriugena noted that such things are said to be 'through themselves' because 'no creature is interposed between them and the one Cause of all things'. Moreover, and critically, given the terms of article seven,

while they subsist immutably in it they [are] the primordial causes of other causes which come after them ... Therefore, the primordial causes which the divine sages call the principles of all things are Goodness-through itself, ... Truth-through-itself, ..., and all the powers and reasons which once and for all the Father made in the Son and after which the order of all things is woven ... For whatever things are good are good by participation in the Good-through-itself ... And the same applies to the rest. For there is not found in the nature of things any power ... which does not proceed by an ineffable participation from the primordial causes.⁶⁶

Eriugena argued explicitly that such principal causes were eternal, stating: ‘God the Father and the Word and the causes created in it, are co-eternal’, although, as noted by the dialogue’s Alumnus, ‘they receive the beginning of their being not from themselves but from their Creator’. But, as Eriugena states subsequently,

whatsoever is substantially in God the Word, since nothing but the Word Itself is eternal, must (themselves) be eternal, and therefore we conclude that the Word Itself and the multiple and most primary reason of the whole created universe are one and the same thing.

This last point appears to deny such causes were separate from God, but Eriugena’s approach remains problematic and also arguably approaching pantheistic – hence the alleged link to Amaury of Bène. The fact that Eriugena’s primordial causes are both created and create was also wholly unacceptable to Catholic theology.⁶⁷

Amaury of Bène, Joachim of Fiore and David of Dinant

Three later theologians who caused concern at the university at Paris in the early thirteenth century were Joachim of Fiore (†1202), Amaury of Bène (†1206) and David of Dinant (†c.1217). All three appear to have been influenced, at least partly, by Greek theology and Neoplatonism, and there are possible connections between the doctrines of all three and Aristotelian natural philosophy. They therefore fall to be considered together. The views of both Amaury – as alleged by Henry Hostiensis – and David of Dinant may have been influenced by Eriugena, while Joachim’s views resembled those of Gilbert of Poitiers in some respects. Their writings largely pre-dated 1215 but all of them figured in the events of that year. Their impact can be seen as contributing to the nervousness over Aristotle and over pantheistic ideas in the crucial period from 1215 to 1241/4. They thus form part of the context for, and can perhaps be linked to, the condemnation.

In summary, Amaury’s teaching practices and doctrines came under censure at the university early in the thirteenth century, and in 1206 he applied to Pope Innocent III for vindication. This was denied and the university then compelled his recantation. He died soon afterwards. David of Dinant’s *Quateruli* was ordered to be burnt in the Archbishop of Sens’ decree following the Council of Paris in 1210 – the council which also prohibited teaching Aristotle’s works of natural

philosophy and ordered Amaury's excommunication and exhumation. Robert of Courçon's university statute in 1215 included a ban on reading Amaury's and David of Dinant's works, together with those of an unidentified Mauricius of Spain (possibly Avicenna) and Aristotelian texts on metaphysics and natural philosophy, or summaries of them; and some theological tracts in French were required to be handed over to local bishops. Finally, Amaury and Joachim were both named in Lateran IV, together with heretics more generally. However, while Amaury's teachings were condemned utterly, only Joachim's Trinitarian views and his attack on Peter Lombard were censored.⁶⁸

In more detail, Joachim does not appear to have been directly connected with the university at Paris. His relevance to the condemnation may be primarily as a conduit through which Gilbert of Poitiers' views reached thirteenth-century theologians there; indeed, Marie-Dominique Chenu sees his influence as critical in Gilbert's revival, although any very close affinity between Joachim's and Gilbert's views is now viewed as suspect.⁶⁹ Joachim appears to have focussed on the Trinity and the meaning of history. On the Trinity, his *Psalterium decem chordarum* attacked the Arians and Sabellians, possibly referring to contemporaries. It contained Joachim's main attack on Peter Lombard's position; and it is the extant work most closely resembling the views accredited to Joachim in Lateran IV. Joachim's *libellum sive tractatum ... de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis*, referred to in the second canon of Lateran IV, is lost – it may have been a version of the *Psalterium*, but equally it could be separate and could contain a clearer account of Joachim's position. Either way, Lateran IV remains a crucial guide to his views. This stated that Joachim viewed the persons of the Trinity as many in one 'collective ('collectivam')' unity – similar to many faithful people constituting one Church. It thus implied a more substantial difference than merely relational and resembled the overall direction, but not detail, of Gilbert's thought, the possible genesis for article two.⁷⁰

Amaury of Bène was a theologian at the university at Paris. His followers, the Amalricians, although initially probably restricted to theologians at the university, appear subsequently to have extended throughout the province of Sens and the dioceses of Paris, Troyes and Langres – indeed their arrests in 1210 occurred outside Paris. The doctrine for which Amaury was condemned was pantheism – a doctrine in all likelihood partially underlying the condemnation, for example, over the world's creation (article eight). The official account states that the Amalricians' beliefs included: the 'Father worked from the beginning without the Son and the Holy Spirit'; and 'All things are one, for whatever is, is God'.⁷¹

Finally, David of Dinant also probably taught at Paris. However, little is known of his life, and his theories are largely known through the later accounts by Albertus Magnus and Aquinas, although some fragments remain which reveal his pantheism. David brought some of Aristotle's works to France and drew on them, in particular the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. Although his interest seems to have been primarily scientific rather than theological, his use may have contributed to the measures against Aristotle's works in 1210. David also used Neoplatonic concepts. He discussed the separation of all things into three categories – bodies, souls and eternal substances – concluding: 'these three are one and the same; from

which it follows that all things are one in their essence ... It is clear, therefore, that there is only one substance, not only of all bodies but also of all souls, and this substance is nothing other than God himself'. Albertus Magnus linked David's views with Plato's, and ridiculed them.⁷²

Gilbert of Poitiers and his followers

The final theologian linked, implicitly, to Lateran IV was Gilbert of Poitiers. Gilbert's views, like Eriugena's, were heavily influenced by Greek theology, an area on which he was accounted an authority. The censured work, nearly a hundred years before the condemnation, was his commentary on the *Opuscula sacra* of the early sixth-century Roman senator and philosopher Boethius.⁷³

Gilbert's views on the Trinity were the main area of concern and fall within the area of articles two and three of the condemnation – indeed, they appear to have been the likely inspiration for article two's offending proposition. His arguments are complex and need to be seen in the context of the preceding debates by Latin theologians on God, who is simple and immutable, not composite, but at the same time a Trinity, with three persons who need to be three but remain one, and the 'notions' associated with each (for the Father, innascibility, paternity and common spiration; for the Son, sonship and common spiration; for the Holy Spirit, procession).⁷⁴ Much of the discussion took as its starting point distinctions made to explain the conundrum by Boethius between three concepts which differed for all things except God, where they are one: 'that which is ('id quod est')', which represents the thing itself, such as a human, and is the subject for accidents, such as beauty, for everything except God who is not a subject; 'that by which a thing is what it is ('id quo')', the immanent form of everything; and 'being ('esse')'. Relations, such as father, son, etc., are not accidents as they do not change anything in the subject to which they apply. They can therefore apply to the three persons of the Trinity.⁷⁵ Boethius in turn built his analysis on Aristotle's *Categories*. Subsequent theologians developed this foundation with variations, in particular exploring whether, and if so, how, relationships could explain the differences between the three persons, and the alternatives.

The Holy Spirit's position presented particular problems.⁷⁶ For example, the twelfth-century theologian, Anselm of Canterbury, was concerned that, if relationships were the factor differentiating between the three persons of the Trinity, they must be opposing, not merely differing, relations.⁷⁷ Otherwise, the unity of the Father would be jeopardised, since he had different relations with the Son and Holy Spirit and would be two different persons. But this meant the relationship between the Son and Holy Spirit must also be opposing or they would be the same as each other. Anselm's solution, therefore, entailed the dual procession of the Holy Spirit (article three). Peter Lombard argued 'the properties are in the three persons ('proprietas esse in tribus personis'), and they are the persons themselves and the divine essence ('et ipsas esse personas atque divinam essentiam')', a position criticised by Gilbert of Poitiers and Joachim of Fiore as creating a fourth person in the Trinity, but which Lateran IV established as the

official Catholic doctrine.⁷⁸ These views all relied on internal and interdependent relationships, and, hypothetically, none was wholly sufficient to distinguish the three persons, at least without risk of multiplication.

An alternative approach was to maintain, as Gilbert of Poitiers did, that the three persons are distinguished by their individual properties ('*proprietas*'), 'by the opposition of things attached from outside ('*extrinsecus affixarum rerum oppositione a se invicem*'), ensuring their separate identity.⁷⁹ In this context, the *Treatise on the Trinity*, a work attributed to Gilbert, is helpful, even if it may not fully reflect his views but rather how his followers understood them. This argues that '... it is outside the essence and the persons that you must find something that makes the persons differ and makes them more than one'. This 'something' is the '*id quo*', which for the Father is *generatio*, for the Son *nativitas*, and for the Holy Spirit *connexio*. These 'are not natures' but 'theological reasons ... not temporal but eternal, and oppose each other so much that each person is truly distinct from the other'.⁸⁰ In Gilbert's own terminology, the persons are distinct 'in *ratione formarum*', the '*id quo*' exterior to the essence.

However, Gilbert's discussion of properties runs, in turn, into difficulties of its own, as the unity of the three persons is jeopardised – their differences are external, not internal (as for relationships). Chenu accordingly argues that, in order to achieve the reduction of the three persons to a substantial unity, Gilbert's followers, utilising Gilbert's concept of '*forma*', accomplished this, for the Father and Son, through the reciprocal nature of their differences ('*generatio*', '*nativitas*'), rendering them fully complementary 'in *ratione formarum*'. But the reduction cannot take place in the same way for the Holy Spirit, whose '*id quo*' is '*nexus/connexio*', since '*connexio*' does not have a reciprocal relationship with '*generatio*' or '*nativitas*'. The Holy Spirit is therefore different in '*id quo*', i.e. form ('in *ratione formarum*'). However, he is the same in essence – the proposition condemned in article two – the apparently self-contradictory position resulting from the identity of '*id quo*' with essence in God, as established by Boethius.⁸¹

Moreover, while Gilbert did not advocate the single procession of the Holy Spirit, if '*processio*' is dual the problem over reciprocal relationships would be exacerbated, impossible to dismiss as mere semantics. The Holy Spirit would be a double recipient, which would not match the single procession issuing from the Father and Son respectively. Thus, the doctrine of the dual procession (the *filioque*) is jeopardised, and the proposition condemned in article three follows.

It appears that Gilbert's commentary on the *Opuscula sacra*, and also the works of his followers or those misattributed to Gilbert, were still being read and their contents seen as dangerous in the 1230s. Gilbert's conflict with Bernard of Clairvaux, which Bernard recorded, was reported in detail by, for example, the Cistercian Helinand of Froidmont (†after 1229) and the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais (†c.1264). Moreover, numerous extant manuscripts survive, showing his work remained popular. Finally, several thirteenth-century theologians knew his works, directly or indirectly, including Alexander of Hales and Albertus Magnus who, like many others, reached him through Bernard of Clairvaux, while Stephen Langton, theologian at Paris until 1206, seems to have read Gilbert's

actual works. Such texts would probably have been uncorrected.⁸² Others citing his works included Gueric of St.-Quentin, who referred to 'Porretanus' in his quodlibets in a discussion on the personal properties or notions. At least two questions in Douai, MS 434, referred to him, one (Question 34) concerning his 'primus error' about the divine nature, the other (Question 423) in the context of grace and merits. Gilbert's views appear to have been discussed, even if without attribution, by other major theologians, including William of Auvergne in his *De Trinitate*, who probably took one of the three different, but not wholly inadmissible, positions on the role of the notions (paternity, etc.) from Gilbert's doctrine.⁸³ Finally, as discussed above, Joachim of Fiore's works may have served as a conduit for an approximation of Gilbert's views.

Twelfth-century debates

Finally, one twelfth-century Latin debate, not connected to Lateran IV, seems to have been picked up by William of Auvergne and appears to underlie the second possible limb of article seven (eternal truths).

The twelfth century saw heated debates between 'realists', who believed something must actually exist behind words and concepts, and 'nominalists', who did not. The nominalists believed God, whose knowledge was unchangeable, knew 'stateables', which therefore could not change from true to false (or vice versa), and had no temporal differentiation between past, present and future. These could, arguably, be eternal truths, separate from God. In contrast, the realists believed 'stateables' could change their truth-value. Some of them accordingly appear to have accepted that God's knowledge could therefore change. Among the twelfth- and early thirteenth-century authors who raised this issue were Robert of Melun (†1167), John of Salisbury (†1180), Peter of Poitiers (†c.1215), Alexander Nequam (†1217) and the anonymous author of a logic text, the *Ars meliduna*, written c. 1170–80.⁸⁴

Conclusion

The events of 1241/4 had their main roots in 1215 and Lateran IV's statement of faith. But the issues reflected in the condemnation – and indeed in Lateran IV itself – had their genesis in Latin debates stretching back long before 1215. This was not merely part of a trend of reverence for previous authorities and a backward-facing tradition in theology, but rather because, as demonstrated by the views of Eriugena, Joachim of Fiore, Amaury of Bène, David of Dinant and Gilbert of Poitiers, although apparently settled and the aberrant views declared heretical, the issues were complex, at the heart of Christian doctrine and insoluble by reason alone.

The impact of philosophy

Lateran IV focused on establishing Catholic theology and refuting erroneous Catholic views. But the period immediately preceding it, and between Lateran IV

and 1241/4, contained critical developments which helped shape these views and also formed part of the context for both Lateran IV and the condemnation. Successive popes were clearly concerned over perceived threats from the influx of newly translated philosophical texts, in particular Aristotle's works of natural philosophy and metaphysics, translated in Sicily/Southern Italy or Spain and accompanied by commentaries mainly by Arab philosophers.⁸⁵ These were not written by Christians – thus any 'theology' they contained, whether Aristotle's unmoved mover or Arab beliefs, could be ignored; but the metaphysical and logical arguments underpinning them, such as Aristotle's arguments for the eternity of the world, could not. Actions at Paris included those taken to ban or restrict such works at Sens in 1210, in the 1215 university statutes, and in *Parens scientiarum* in 1231. Significantly, while the 1210 and 1215 bans applied to both faculties at Paris, they were limited to teaching ('legere'), while the 1231 ban, for the arts faculty only, banned all use ('uti'), suggesting increased concern, although theologians were evidently seen as more able to deal with the threat. While there are indications that the banned works were seen as potentially useful, as in Gregory IX's support for Michael Scot, these cannot detract from the overall impression of deep suspicion.⁸⁶

The new texts, and their detailed content, are thus important for understanding the issues in the condemnation and why they were troublesome. However, they form a complex category. In simple terms, there were three periods of influence from Greek philosophy and associated commentaries. Up to the twelfth century, Latin theologians were restricted to a handful of texts, mainly translations by Boethius, comprising part of Plato's *Timaeus* and many of Aristotle's logical works. Following small-scale translation activity in the tenth and eleventh centuries, the twelfth, especially its second half, saw an influx of new texts, including most of Aristotle's works of natural philosophy and metaphysics and commentaries based on them, in particular by Avicenna. Finally, the 1220s onwards saw a second wave of translations, many by Michael Scot, bringing Averroes' works to the west, including his commentaries on Aristotle's works, which, while not translations, provided detailed interpretations. This was also the period when the *Guide for the Perplexed*, by the Jewish philosopher Maimonides, was probably translated into Latin.

This sequence, however, ignores the underlying connections. First, the early Church Fathers, especially Greek, but also Latin Fathers such as Augustine, and subsequently Boethius, had far greater access to ancient Greek texts, and these naturally permeated their works.⁸⁷ Subsequent Latin theologians thus had indirect knowledge of Platonic (and Neoplatonic) and Aristotelian learning through those writing in Latin as well as through the limited early Latin translations of the texts and of the Greek Fathers.

Second, any description of the texts as 'Aristotelian', or as based on his philosophy, ignores the combination of Neoplatonic and Aristotelian views they included. The early translations of Aristotle's own works were sometimes patchy and tended to be read through the often distorting lens of the Arab philosophers commenting on them. The much read *Liber de causis*, translated into Latin by

Gerard of Cremona (†1187), was believed by most contemporaries to be by Aristotle, but was in fact largely Neoplatonic; and the *Liber de causis primis et secundis et de fluxu qui consequitur eas*, from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, offered an extraordinary mixture of the ideas of the Greek Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus (†485), Eriugena and Avicenna.⁸⁸ Moreover, because translations were done in very literal, word for word, terms, the twelfth-century translations of Aristotle's works were couched in very poor Latin and thus hard to understand, resulting in the need for accompanying commentaries. The study of Aristotle in the first half of the thirteenth century was, therefore, dependent to a large extent on Avicenna's heavily Neoplatonic and at times controversial version of his theories, followed by Averroes' more accurate interpretations from the 1230s – but Averroes' views themselves became controversial in the following decades, and his influence, anyway, was only gradually being felt in the period before the condemnation.⁸⁹

All this meant that many of the ideas coming in with the translations in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries would have been distorted and would not have been completely new. However, even if sometimes mangled or partially already known, the new works must have had a major impact. In particular, although some of Aristotle's works remained untranslated, and despite any Neoplatonic overlay, they presented his views on natural philosophy and metaphysics as complete theories for the first time – and their full implications could therefore be realised. Moreover, Aristotle's authorship gave them authority.⁹⁰

Aristotle

The examination of the philosophical sources that could have influenced the 1241/4 condemnation must thus necessarily start with Aristotle. By the end of the twelfth century many of Aristotle's scientific works had been translated into Latin, giving scholars a fairly comprehensive picture of his views. Crucially, Aristotle's *Physics*, large parts of the *Metaphysics* (lacking book XI which dealt with the impossibility of infinity existing), *Posterior Analytics* and *De anima*, all now became available in their entirety, together with works such as *De generatione et corruptione* and *De animalibus*.⁹¹

Four areas of Aristotle's philosophy were particularly relevant to the condemnation. First, his conviction that a physical medium existed between the thing seeing and the object seen was relevant to article one (the beatific vision). He argued:

[I]t is not true that the beholder sees, and the object is seen, in virtue of some merely abstract relationship between them

This is because 'what has the perceptive faculty' is changed by seeing something, but this cannot be by 'the seen colour itself'. So it must be affected by 'what comes between' – hence there must be something between. Indeed, 'if there were nothing, so far from seeing with greater distinctness, we should see nothing at all'.⁹²

Second, Aristotle's view of knowledge was potentially relevant to the issues underlying several articles in the condemnation, including articles one (the beatific vision), seven (eternal truths) and nine (gifts, grace and glory). In his *Posterior Analytics*, he argued the soul's highest part was occupied by mind, or reason, the place for thought and understanding. Thought allowed intellectual knowledge only of universals, whereas sensation concerned particulars. But if 'the propositions from which a deduction proceeds are universal ... it is necessary for the conclusion of such a demonstration ... to be eternal'. You cannot demonstrate or understand perishable things '*simpliciter* but only incidentally, because nothing holds of them universally ...'. However, knowledge was possible where the universal was instantiated in only one object – for example, an eclipse, since all individual instances had the same cause. Thus, individual humans and their actions would not be knowable, as implicit in article nine. Moreover, theologians such as William of Auvergne interpreted the theory as meaning that God himself would not be knowable, as required by article one, since he was a particular (although, since he had only one instantiation, this was arguably a misinterpretation). Finally, the actuality of the Intellect was the same thing as the Intellect's object. This was relevant to whether God knew multiple things and whether multiple truths existed (article seven).⁹³

Third, Aristotle believed in universal causation and that creation from nothing was impossible. This was relevant to article eight. There could be no uncaused motions, and nothing was independent, or chaos would result. However, an infinite regression was impossible – as was infinity itself, since it could not be traversed. There must therefore be an unmoved first mover, lacking matter and potentiality, as the mere power to move or change the world would not ensure its eternal motion. It was therefore pure actuality. It could not be an efficient cause or active creator – this would involve a change in itself – but rather a final cause, an object of love that the universe strove towards and depended on. But, despite references to his eternal nature, goodness and love, Aristotle's God had no care for the universe.⁹⁴ Although Aristotle's main discussion on infinity was unavailable, much of it was discernible in his other works or commentaries on them. Other parts of his theory came in his *Physics*, where he argued that, for matter to exist, 'something must have existed as a primary substratum from which it should come and which should persist in it'. However, as this must be its own special nature, it will exist before it comes into existence. Moreover, 'if it ceases to be it will pass into that at the last, so it will have ceased to be before ceasing to be'.⁹⁵

Fourth, on the beginning or first moment of time, the 'tempus nunc' of article eight, Aristotle asked whether 'there was some time when motion came to be, not existing before then', and whether 'it will cease to be again in such a way that nothing is moved, or did it neither come to be nor will it cease to be'. He replied that time must be eternal – 'now' links the past and future and is inextricably part of time, so time can have no beginning or end. There can be no 'now' without another 'now' before and after it.⁹⁶

Finally, Aristotle's scientific works contained some key concepts which appeared frequently in arguments by Christian theologians in the first half of the

thirteenth century relevant to the issues in the condemnation, sometimes drawn from Arab or Jewish texts. These therefore provide helpful indications of the use of the new learning and the complexities it brought with it. They include Aristotle's forms of causation: material, formal, efficient and final. Change was the movement from potentiality to actuality, involving three factors: an underlying thing (often matter); privation (the underlying thing could not already have the new feature); and form (the aspect the thing took afterwards).⁹⁷

Neoplatonism and the Liber de causis

While Neoplatonic theories were not part of the new Aristotelian learning, they were often confused with it, in particular the text perhaps most influential in the period before the condemnation, the *Liber de causis*.⁹⁸ The *Liber*'s use by Parisian scholars was prolific, probably starting with Alan of Lille, under the name *Aphorismi de essentia summae bonitatis*. Many others followed, including William of Auxerre in his *Summa aurea* (c.1215–20), William of Auvergne in his *De bono et malo* (1220s), Philip the Chancellor in his *Summa de bono* (probably 1230s) and Alexander of Hales (or his collaborators) in their *Summa theologica* (from after c.1236). These authors all attributed the work to Aristotle. The Dominican Roland of Cremona was probably the first to use the title *Liber de causis* (in his *Summa*, probably soon after 1233); and Bonaventure, Roger Bacon and others cited it frequently. Finally, although later than the condemnation, the *Liber* was included, c.1250, in the faculty of arts' curriculum at Paris as the text-book on the metaphysics of divine substances as principles of being, mistaken for the final part of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.⁹⁹

The *Liber*'s doctrines were relevant to three articles of the condemnation. First, on time and creation (article eight), its discussion of the 'First Cause', 'Intelligence' and 'Soul' envisaged a trinal deity existing before time. It identified the First Cause with 'Pure Goodness', 'the First Pure Infinite' and 'the being that is before eternity ('ante aeternitatem')'. The *Liber* stated: 'All eternity is being, but not all being is eternity. Therefore, being is more common than eternity, because eternity is its effect ('aeternitas est causatum ipsius')'. Combined with Neoplatonic tripartite structure and spirituality, this could have been attractive for Christian theologians as a philosophical basis for theology. But the temporal differentiation that followed was problematic. 'Intelligence', it argued, was 'coexistent with eternity ('parificatur aeternitati') and not in time, because it was the second being', and 'Soul' was 'after eternity ('post aeternitatem')', albeit still beyond time ('supra tempus'), because 'it is on the horizon of eternity from below and beyond time'. Moreover, the *Liber*'s role for Intelligence and the intelligences, with sub-creative powers, whereby the First Cause 'creates Intelligence without an intermediary and creates Soul and Nature and the rest of things by mediation of Intelligence ('mediante intelligentia')', was, at the least, dubious.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, Bonaventure specifically condemned the doctrine of creation 'mediante intelligentia', arguing that it attempted sacrilegiously to limit divine power.¹⁰¹

Second, again on the nature and role of the First Cause, Intelligence and the intelligences, there were implications for article seven (eternal truths). The *Liber* stated:

Every intelligence is full of forms ('plena est formis'); however, among intelligences are those that contain fewer universal forms, and among them are those that contain more universal forms.

Moreover, elaborating on this, every 'divine intelligence' knew things 'inasmuch as it is an intelligence' and governed them 'inasmuch as it is divine', because 'the property of intelligence is knowledge'.¹⁰² Indeed, following Aristotle, since 'Intelligence is both what understands and what is understood ... it sees its own essence', and, in doing so, 'it knows that it understands its own essence by virtue of its own cognitive act'. Also,

when it knows its own essence, it knows other things that are under it, because they come from it. Nevertheless, they are in it in an intelligible mode. Therefore, Intelligence and the things understood are one ('intelligentia scit essentiam suam et scit res intellectas simul').¹⁰³

This doctrine was problematic for article seven for two reasons. If intelligences were equated with the universal forms they contained, potentially they could represent eternal truths which, while divine, were not God. Second, the equation of things known with the one knowing could entail multiple eternal truths if the one knowing was itself eternal. Moreover, Intelligence was created, but the role given to it was arguably divine.

Finally, in a passage relevant to article nine (natural gifts, grace and glory), the *Liber* discussed the relationship between the amount of gifts a created being receives and its ability to receive and take delight in the One, directly equating the two. It argued that those receiving 'perfections' did not receive them equally. The First Cause existed in everything 'according to one and the same disposition', but everything did not similarly exist in the First Cause. However, this diversity came from the recipient, not the First Cause. This meant that things were able to receive and delight in the First Cause in proportion to their proximity to it and their capacity to receive it.¹⁰⁴

Avicenna

The various bans issued in Paris prior to the condemnation covered not only Aristotle's new works but the commentaries with which they were accompanied. These were numerous, by both Arab and Jewish philosophers.¹⁰⁵ Of those translated and read by Latin scholars in the period of the condemnation and influencing them, either in their own right or as secondary sources for Aristotelian or Neoplatonic views, the three whose works seem most relevant to its contents were Avicenna (†1037), many of whose works were available in translation from the

late twelfth century; Averroes (†1198), influential to a lesser extent, since translation of his works only started with Michael Scot in the 1220s – he did not take centre stage until the 1250s when the availability of new, more accurate translations of Aristotle's works made Averroes' commentaries more comprehensible; and Maimonides (†1204), whose *Guide for the Perplexed* may not have been properly available in translation until the early 1240s, although parts reached Latin theologians earlier, either directly or indirectly. As with Aristotle himself, while the theology could be safely ignored by Catholic theologians, the underpinning metaphysical and logical arguments could not. Moreover, the issues discussed, such as God's knowledge and the world's eternity, were already on the Latin agenda, and where plausible or even compelling arguments from Avicenna and others resulted in conclusions contrary to Christianity, this was a matter of concern.

Avicenna was the major Arab influence before the condemnation, frequently cited by, among others, William of Auvergne.¹⁰⁶ His twelfth-century translators saw the parts of his *Metaphysics of Healing* that they translated as deriving from, complementing or explaining Aristotle's works.¹⁰⁷ The continuing confusion between the two led to Latin scholars in the first half of the thirteenth century reading Aristotle through an Avicennian lens – indeed, even apparently direct quotations from Aristotle might contain Avicenna's rather than Aristotle's views.

Avicenna's views were complex. Five inter-connected areas – God's knowledge of particulars, individuation by matter for souls after death, vision, angels and the eternity of the world – were relevant to the condemnation.

The question of whether God knew particulars or universals troubled Muslim and Jewish, not just Christian, theologians. Aristotle's limitation of knowledge to universals and individuals instantiated by only one object, coupled with the Neoplatonic and Aristotelian concepts of his self-contemplation, was the starting point and sub-text of medieval discussions on how God and, by extrapolation, human souls (especially when separated from their bodies and hence sensory perceptions), knew things.¹⁰⁸ Issues included, for God, the need to ensure his knowledge did not cause any change in himself, and whether he knew multiple things. Avicenna's development of Aristotle's views reworked some elements, but the result remained theologically problematic. He first established that God's knowledge was intellectual:

Thus the First [sometimes called by Avicenna the 'Necessary Existent' or 'God'], with respect to having a quiddity denuded [of matter as an object of knowledge] for some thing, is an intellectual apprehender. And, with respect to [the fact] that His [own] quiddity denuded [of matter is an object of knowledge] for some thing, He is an intelligible. This thing is His essence.¹⁰⁹

Thus, God could not know matter, and was limited to self-knowledge of his own essence. However, by knowing himself, God knew the totality of existence coming from his essence, and hence knew the whole world he emanated. Since he knew his own essence, which was identical to his existence, and since all things flowed from his existence, he knew all existence in a single timeless instance.

Moreover, since God's knowledge preceded everything both ontologically and causally, creation resulted from his knowledge. But, as for Aristotle, this knowledge was limited to universals – to the principles of the existents proceeding from him and what they generated, including 'particular things inasmuch as they are universal'. Nevertheless, such knowledge was arguably of multiple things. They included the celestial spheres as well as angels – angels were intellects with no matter to differentiate them, so only one could exist at any given time.¹¹⁰

The problem of how, and what, God knows underlies article seven. Moreover, Avicenna's restriction of God's knowledge to universals compelled him to restrict God's knowledge of humans on earth to their existence and inclusion in the species 'man'. This logically applied both in respect of individual embodied human souls and individual human acts or events, including those justifying celestial reward or punishment – to know a specific act or event it needed to be attributed to something which could itself be known as an individual. This was unacceptable theologically. Avicenna was himself aware of the problem, commenting that 'this is one of the wonders whose conception requires the subtlety of an inborn, acute intelligence'.¹¹¹ The doctrine was incompatible with article nine.

The second issue, conversely, concerned human knowledge of God. It resulted from Avicenna's view on individuation by matter. Avicenna believed objects were individuated essentially through matter, but his views were unclear and contradictory on the human soul when it was no longer combined with matter.¹¹² His starting point was the one universal soul. This was individuated in individual bodies – it was 'a primary actualisation or perfection' that attached 'to a natural body that has the potential for life'.¹¹³ Logically this meant he should believe there was only one soul after the death of the individuating body.¹¹⁴ But denial of a soul's individuality after death and bodily separation negated any future individual relationship with, and vision of, God (article one). Moreover, no individual residence of glorified souls in the empyrean heaven (article four), and no individual rewards (article nine) would be possible.

Avicenna himself struggled with the issue. He was driven to conclude the soul remained individual, although his own arguments had to be mangled to support this. In *De anima*, he offered three options for what happens to souls after their separation from the body. He dismissed the first two – that souls also pass away or all become one single soul. This left the third, that they continue to exist as individual souls – but that begged the question of how they could do this. Avicenna argued that 'after the souls are separated from the bodies, there is no question that each one will have existed as a singular thing by reason of the difference of the matters they were in'. Moreover, 'what makes the universal account exist as an identifiable individual cannot make it exist as an individual unless it adds to it (over and above what species it is) one of the individual factors ... that attaches to it at its orientation by which it becomes an individual and which our knowledge of it requires or we do not know'. However, Avicenna continued, he knew the soul, while single before joined to a particular body, did not remain singular when so joined: otherwise all knowledge would be the same. Therefore it had to be individuated subsequently, but not through its imprinting in matter, since that

would be lost on death, but ‘rather that thing belonging to the soul is a certain configuration, or a certain potentiality, or a certain accidental incorporeal quality, or the sum of them together [that] collectively individuates the soul, even if we do not know what it is’.¹¹⁵

Third, Avicenna’s theory of vision, based on Aristotle’s, was relevant to article one as it interposed a medium between the viewer and the object seen. He argued that we see,

when the intervening transparent body becomes effectively transparent by light shining upon it, then an impression of the outspread (flattened) individual of such sensible objects as are seen is effected in the crystalline lens of the eye, just such a pictorial impression as is effected in mirrors; indeed the two effects are so similar that were mirrors possessed of a seeing power they would perceive the form imprinted in them. This is Aristotle’s way; and it is the sound reliable opinion.¹¹⁶

The analogy of mirrors was often used by medieval theologians in a similar way to Avicenna’s use here.¹¹⁷

The fourth issue concerned angels, which Avicenna equated with celestial intelligences or intellects.¹¹⁸ The role of angels was directly relevant to the issues in article seven, with potential application to several others, including article eight, if they were assigned creative powers. Following Neoplatonic emanation theory, Avicenna placed angels next to the ‘First’, or the ‘One’. The closest to humans was the last of the ‘separate intellects’, ‘from which there emanates, in participation with the celestial movements, something having the configuration of the forms of the lower world’, the ‘giver of forms (‘dator formarum’), from which the ‘forms [the substantial forms of the physical world] emanate’.¹¹⁹ Potentially, angels, if equated with such forms, could represent eternal truths, which, while divine, were not God.

Averroes criticised al-Fārābī and Avicenna, arguing that they agreed with Plato’s theory in the *Timaeus* that forms were given by the second gods. It appears that Latin theologians in the 1220s and 1230s therefore tended to conflate the views and often used the term ‘create’ for both Plato’s second gods and Avicenna’s giver of forms. This conflation, in fact, misrepresented Avicenna, whose giver of forms did not create forms but interacted with matter: when this was ready, a form or new form flowed upon it from the ‘giver of forms’ as a necessary process of nature – necessary through another, possible through itself.¹²⁰

The final major issue related to article eight – both whether there was a first moment of time and whether a ‘creator’ entailed simultaneous creation. On these, Avicenna adopted many Aristotelian principles, with his own variations. He summarised the key elements of his theory. First, there exists an ‘infinite incorporeal power’, which is ‘the principle of primary motion’, and ‘the circular [heavenly] motion is not temporally generated [literally, ‘not formed in a temporal way’, i.e. with no beginning in time]’. This ‘is a principle permanent in existence’. Second, ‘the Existent Necessary in Himself is a necessary existent in all His aspects’;

hence ‘a state which did not exist previously’ could not ‘commence for Him’. Thus, critically, ‘the cause in [terms of] itself necessitates the effect, so that, if it is permanent, it necessitates the effect permanently’.¹²¹ Avicenna stressed the consequences of the Necessary Existent’s unchangeable essence, arguing that ‘what proceeds from the Necessary Existent is necessary. Otherwise, [the Necessary Existent] would have a state which did not [previously] exist’ and would thus have suffered change.¹²² Thus, if the one essence were to remain unchanged, and if nothing had come into existence from it, nothing could do so and the world must be eternal. This kind of argument was central to the dilemma many Latin theologians tried to address on creation and ‘creatio-passio’ (the second limb of article eight).

As part of his argument, Avicenna saw the relationship of cause to effect as critical. He argued that there must be a cause if something is to move from potentially to actually existing. But, if ‘this essence belonging to the cause [remains] as it had been and is not rendered preponderant, and [if] this preponderance does not ensue necessarily from it ... then there must be a new occurrence that necessitates preponderance in this essence, if it is the efficient cause’. Otherwise, no change could be effected. Thus the First Cause and First Effect must be simultaneous in time, although ontologically cause precedes effect. In particular, if the First Cause preceded his creation by time as well as essence, ‘there would have been an existence that had passed before He created creation, that existence being finite. There would therefore have been time before motion and time’.¹²³

This last point also touched on the concept of ‘primum nunc’, the first limb of article eight. However, Avicenna’s main arguments on the impossibility of a first or last moment of time came in his *Physics*. He argued that, although an instant of time, or ‘the now’, appeared to relate to time, this was only our perception: ‘it would be actual only if time were, in some way, severed’. But the continuity of time could not be severed, because, if so, ‘that severance must be either at the beginning of time or at its end’. If at the beginning, then ‘that time has no before’. However, in that case, ‘it could not have been nonexistent and then existed’, because it would then exist after not existing, and thus its nonexistence would be before its existence. Avicenna argued that, in that case, ‘it must have a before, and that before is something different from the nonexistence describing it’. Taking this argument to its logical conclusion resulted, in his view, in a contradiction. No first moment of time was therefore possible. Equally, no last moment was possible, a conclusion Avicenna reached after a convoluted argument based on the concepts of necessity and potentiality – whether it was possible for some time to exist after an endpoint, and whether such existence would be a necessary existence.¹²⁴

Finally, on the question whether God created the world from nothing, implicit in both limbs of article eight, Avicenna’s argument that the First Cause existed prior to the world ontologically, not temporally, bypassed this to some extent – as the world had no temporal beginning, the issue faced by those viewing creation sequentially did not arise in the same form. However, as the world’s existence

depended wholly on God, Avicenna could argue that creation was from nothing, a point he made explicitly in his *Metaphysics*.¹²⁵

The Liber de causis primis et secundis et de fluxu qui consequitur eas

A heavily Neoplatonic work from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, which drew copiously on Avicenna, the anonymous *Liber de causis primis et secundis* bears directly on several issues in the condemnation. It also demonstrates the amorphous mixture of different influences present in many works from the period, whether by Latin theologians (as its own author probably was), or those they read. It amalgamated the systems in the *Liber de causis*, Eriugena and Avicenna, with other borrowings including from Augustine and Boethius, and testifies to the entry of Avicenna's *Metaphysics* to western philosophy.¹²⁶

The *Liber's* use of its sources was problematic, going beyond normal medieval appropriation. This was partly because it concealed its reliance on the *Liber de causis*, Eriugena and Avicenna, while Aristotle, Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa and pseudo-Dionysius were cited openly as authorities, sometimes hiding the fact that the passages were in fact borrowed from, for example, the *Periphyseon*.¹²⁷ The author was thus able to claim his work represented authoritative truth, when in fact it was a conflation of theories, some with authority in the Latin world, others not. Moreover, he ensured his borrowings did not contradict each other and all supported the same conclusion by various devices, such as arbitrary reconciliation of different words or concepts. But, more serious in terms of falsification, the author appeared sometimes deliberately to alter the import of what his authorities had said. Examples included replacing Eriugena's 'Filius' by 'sapientia' in a passage from the *Periphyseon*, thus removing its religious connotation, and abridging a quotation from Augustine in a passage on the beatific vision (discussed further below).¹²⁸

In terms of the *Liber's* content, God was first, indivisible unity and pure simplicity. The prototypes of all things existed in God's wisdom and were eternal in an unchanging God – God's immutable knowledge resulted from the presence of the causes of all being in him. Thus, creation was a manifestation of divine ideas. The book went so far as to assert:

[T]he divine essence, which existing through itself is above all intellect, in those things which were made through it and in it and in respect of it, is rightly said to be created ('sic divina essentia ... recte dicitur creari').¹²⁹

This has a bearing on the issue of eternal truths (article seven) and 'creatio-passio' (article eight). The subsequent account of creation was, moreover, strongly Neoplatonic.

The *Liber* also discussed how, and what, humans could know. In a passage relevant to article one (and also illustrating its unattributed borrowings and misrepresentations), it stated that the 'first light' ('lumen primum') of the prime cause was above understanding:

Next we shall show... how the prime cause is above all reason and understanding, and that any understanding of the human mind is only illuminated by the light of the prime cause, so that we may know that the first light is above understanding and that the perfection of understanding is only from the light itself ...

The *Liber* argued that God, undoubtedly, is intelligible. However,

the intelligible observations of those intelligible disciplines [i.e. the sciences] are very different. For both earth and light are visible; however, earth can only be seen if illuminated by light. Therefore ... those things treated in the sciences ... cannot be understood unless illuminated by some other sun, as it were their own, in the mind. Therefore, as in this sun [i.e. the sensible sun] we may note three things: that it exists, that it shines, that it illuminates, thus in that most secret god there are three things: that he exists, that he understands ('quod intelligit'), and that he causes other things to understand. Behold our meanings are open which proceed from the authority of Augustine which we used ...

Therefore the first cause is above them, since it itself is first pure infinity, but the rest are limited ('terminantur').¹³⁰

The curtailment of Augustine's position – the passage omits the words 'that he [God] is comprehended ('intelligitur')' – is relevant to the condemnation. It gave bogus patristic support to the doctrine condemned in article one, that God's essence cannot be seen.

The circulation of the *Liber de causis primis et secundis* remains unclear. But it provides a striking example of how different influences could be manipulated into one amalgam allegedly representing a single authoritative view. This kind of treatise could well have perturbed theologians with its spurious authenticity in controversial areas.

Averroes

Averroes' views were not as well-known or influential as Avicenna's before the 1241/4 condemnation, but they were becoming increasingly important and would have been among those covered in the 1231 dictates of *Parens scientiarum* and earlier pronouncements. They set out Aristotle's views, previously overlaid by Avicenna's interpretation, more accurately. Scholars using Averroes in the 1230s and 1240s included Richard Rufus, who drew heavily on Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *De anima* (on the agent intellect) and *De caelo* (on heavenly movement).¹³¹ Robert Grosseteste cited him by name in c.1235; and William of Auvergne and Philip the Chancellor showed evidence of reading him, although, in contrast to around forty references to Avicenna, William only named Averroes twice, referring to him as 'a most noble/renowned philosopher'.¹³²

While Averroes' doctrine on the agent intellect, perhaps the area most debated by medieval theologians, did not figure explicitly in the condemnation, two of his views related directly to it.¹³³ The first was the beginning of time (article eight). Averroes' *Incoherence of the Incoherence* was not available in Latin, but he also discussed the eternity of the world in his commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *Physics* and *De caelo*. Basing his arguments on the premise that any motion must be preceded by previous motion, or change, or a mover, Averroes followed Aristotle in arguing that, for there to have been a beginning in time, the mover must have been motionless and must have started to move at a specific point prior to any other mover. But this entailed a preceding motion to cause the mover to move. There could not therefore have been any previous movement in time, but rather an eternal movement previous in nature.¹³⁴

The second theory was Averroes' view on knowledge, relevant to article seven. Unlike Avicenna, Averroes believed that God knew neither particulars nor universals. Instead he saw God's knowledge as prior to, above, and the cause of, all other forms of knowledge. While his main account of this was in his untranslated *Treatise on Divine Knowledge*, it also figured in his *Long Commentary on the Metaphysics*, translated into Latin in the 1220s.¹³⁵

Maimonides

The extent of Parisian medieval scholars' access to Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*, his major philosophical and theological treatise, is unclear.¹³⁶ However, it appears any early translations, probably from no earlier than the 1220s, were partial and inaccurate, although as far as they were known they would have been covered by the various prohibitions and restrictions. Görg Hasselhoff argues that the translation of the entire text of the *Guide* followed the 1240 condemnation of the Talmud and was made in Paris, perhaps by one of the Dominicans examining Jewish texts subsequently or by the Jewish convert Nicholas Donin, who instigated the attack on the Talmud and was probably working with them. However, this remains subject to debate, as does the degree of Latin readership of the *Guide* before the 1240s. But, even if only partially known before the 1240s, his influence cannot be discounted.¹³⁷

Four of Maimonides' theories were particularly relevant to the condemnation. First, he explicitly equated angels and Neoplatonic intelligences. This had implications for their role, especially as creators or sub-creators. Moreover, while Maimonides did not call his intelligences Platonic forms or exemplars, for medieval theologians this would have been part of their baggage, and this was dangerous territory in respect of article seven (eternal truths). The enhanced role Maimonides granted such intelligences could also appear to encroach on God's preeminence, the issue underlying article six (angelic location). To have angels and intelligences equated by a Jew could have been particularly worrying given the shared Jewish and Christian Old Testament, with the Jews viewed as its expert literal interpreters.

Maimonides stated that angels existed, were incorporeal, and, interpreting *Elohim* (Exod. xxii:8), were judges under God as supreme judge:

This agrees with the opinion of Aristotle: there is only this difference in the names employed – he uses the term ‘intelligences’, and we say ... ‘angels’. His theory is that the intelligences are intermediate beings between the Prime Cause and existing things, and that they effect the motion of the spheres, on which motion the existence of all things depends. This is also the view ... in all parts of Scripture; every act of God is described as being performed by angels.

Maimonides continued:

Furthermore, we desire to show that the ruling power emanates from the Creator, and is received by the intelligences according to their order; from the intelligences, part of the good and the light bestowed upon them is communicated to the spheres, and the latter ... transmit forces and properties unto the beings of this transient world.

Maimonides envisaged a hierarchical process, whereby ‘the creative act of the Almighty in giving existence to pure intelligences endows the first of them with the power of giving existence to another, and so on, down to the Active Intellect, the lowest of the purely spiritual beings’. Moreover, ‘besides producing other intelligences, each intelligence gives existence to one of the spheres, from the highest down to the lowest’. Critically, Maimonides stressed that, as he had ‘already mentioned ... these theories are not opposed to anything taught by our Prophets or by our Sages’.¹³⁸

Second, Maimonides’ belief that God’s essence was unknowable ran counter to the doctrine in article one (the beatific vision). For example, explaining God’s appearance to Moses (Exod. xxxiii:22), a text frequently discussed by thirteenth-century Paris theologians, Maimonides commented:

In asserting that God withheld from Moses [the higher knowledge] I mean to say that this knowledge was unattainable, that by its nature it was inaccessible to Moses; for man, whilst able to gain perfection by applying his reasoning faculties to the attainment of that which is within reach of his intellect, either weakens his reason or loses it altogether as soon as he ventures to seek a higher degree of knowledge ... unless he be granted a special aid from heaven, as is described in the words, ‘And I will cover thee with my hand until I pass by’.

Maimonides described Moses asking God to let him know his true essence and his attributes, with God replying that he would grant this for his attributes which were simply his actions. However, his ‘true essence could not be perceived’. Indeed:

A boundary is undoubtedly set to the human mind which it cannot pass. There are things [beyond that boundary] which are acknowledged to be inaccessible to human understanding.¹³⁹

Third, there was Maimonides' long and comprehensive discussion on the world's creation, the issue underlying article eight and 'creatio-passio'. A key point was his conclusion that whether creation was from nothing could not be conclusively proved – a point he argued that Aristotle himself accepted, as was also argued by many Paris theologians. Maimonides identified three different theories on creation: those of Moses (that everything was brought by God out of nothing, including time); Plato (that 'a certain substance co-existed with God from eternity', but this did not detract from God's greatness, for God was the cause of its existence and it was for God 'as clay is to the potter'); and Aristotle and his followers (that a corporeal substance could not be created from no such substance, and that the heavens, time and motion were wholly indestructible and unchangeable, with no beginning or end). Maimonides concluded that, while Aristotle's theory of the eternity of the world was incompatible with the 'foundation of our religion', Plato's would be compatible. He implied that the arguments of some rabbis supported the Platonic, or possibly even Aristotelian, view, but asserted that he himself followed Moses, albeit as a tenet of faith, not through demonstrable proof.¹⁴⁰ Modern scholars are divided over whether, despite Maimonides' stated adherence to the principle of creation from nothing, he secretly believed that Aristotle was correct. However, thirteenth-century Christian theologians are unlikely to have shared this scepticism – Maimonides' arguments would almost certainly have been taken at face value. But his implication that differing rabbinic views existed could have inflamed anti-Jewish sentiment.

Fourth, Maimonides' figurative approach to the Old Testament, particularly to Satan's identity and the creation story, conflicted with the literal account in article ten and could have offended Latin theologians. Maimonides praised Jewish biblical interpreters and commended their instruction, which 'makes clear that which appears doubtful, and reveals that which has been hidden, and discloses most of the mysteries of the Law'. He continued:

They say in the Talmud as follows: ... 'The adversary (*satan*), evil inclination (*yeẓer ha-ra'*), and the angel of death, are one and the same being' ... It has thus been shown to you that one and the same thing is designated by these three different terms, and that actions ascribed to these three are in reality of one and the same agent ...

Maimonides repeated the identification referring explicitly to 'our Sages'. This passage is particularly important as it identified the Talmud with doctrines rather than simply representing Maimonides' own interpretation.¹⁴¹ Such interpretation appears incompatible with the literal biblical account.

Finally, Maimonides' discussion on the possible attributes of God is worth noting, although, given the standard Jewish rejection of the Christian Trinity, this

seems unlikely to have caused concern. However, his remarks have some bearing on the issues in article two. Maimonides noted: '[It] would seem that they [relations] may be employed in reference to God, but ... we are convinced of their inadmissibility'. Maimonides argued there could be no relation between God and time or space or any correlation between him and creatures. But he conceded such attributes, 'are the most appropriate of all attributes to be employed ... in reference to God, because they do not imply a plurality of eternal things exists, or that any change takes place in the essence of God, when those things change to which God is in relation'.¹⁴²

Conclusion

Three points emerge from this summary of some of the main philosophical texts included in, or associated with, the Paris bans on Aristotle's natural philosophy and other works.

First, all the authors from Aristotle onwards offered a multi-faceted picture. Despite the explicit reference to Aristotle in many of the works or by those using them, a major strand appears to have been Neoplatonism, present even in those claiming to follow Aristotle. However, increasingly, the logical and metaphysical arguments in Aristotle's natural philosophy and associated texts sharpened the focus on specific issues of concern.

Second, while this book has concentrated on the issues visible in the ten articles, examination of the philosophical texts containing relevant discussions shows that, as in the earlier Latin tradition itself, they formed part of much larger debates on creation, the knowability of God, knowledge itself, angels and other issues. The articles had their genesis in earlier Latin discussions, but aspects of the debates generated by the new learning clearly alarmed some theologians sufficiently for various restrictions to be placed on its use or outright bans. By the 1240s, however, blanket prohibition was no longer seen as appropriate, although concerns over particular areas remained.¹⁴³

Finally, while arguments relating to some of the specific issues in the condemnation can be seen in the works of Avicenna and others, Roger Bacon's reference to the agent intellect, probably in the context of William of Auvergne's pronouncement of the condemnation, suggests less directly related points may have been part of its context and discussed in its formulation. His reference reflects the widespread use of the new learning in the period, the concern it generated, but also, again, that such concern was targeted at specific theories, not at large.

The 1240s were a different period from the 1220s, with the complete outlawing of Eriugena's *Periphyseon*, and the 1230s, which started with the 1231 total ban on Aristotle's works of natural sciences for arts scholars and comprehensive warning for theologians. Instead, the condemnation took the line anticipated in Gregory IX's 1231 letter to 'Master W' and others, to preserve the useful and eradicate the useless; it did not follow earlier precedent and attack works in their entirety.

Threats from outside the Latin Church

The three main potential doctrinal threats from outside the Latin Church between c.1215 and c.1244 came from a combination of alternative beliefs, two from within the Christian Church (Greeks, and professedly Christian groups deemed heretics), and one from outside it but whose interpretation of the Old Testament was respected, the Jews.¹⁴⁴ A final group, the Muslims and Mongols, were less of a doctrinal challenge, but their physical and ideological threat added to the nervousness of the period.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, this last group presented a conversion opportunity – as demonstrated by Gregory IX's attempts to convert them, both in diplomatic correspondence with various sultans and in his remit to the Franciscans to undertake missions to the east (although such diplomacy was combined with his crusading zeal against the Muslims in particular).¹⁴⁶

The early thirteenth century saw significant confrontations with each of the groups outside the Latin Church, all involving theologians connected to Paris, some at the university. The first three, discussed further below, could all potentially have influenced the 1241/4 condemnation's timing or contents – and in any case formed part of the context for its formulation and issue. For the Jews, the coincidence of dates for the Talmud trial and subsequent examination of Jewish texts in the 1240s and the condemnation needs scrutiny. Dealing with heretics was a dominant concern for the Dominicans, with the period seeing the start of the Inquisition, c.1227, under their leadership and the heavy presence in Toulouse, seen as a hotbed of heresy, of Paris theologians, again especially Dominicans. Discussions with the Greeks in the 1230s were challenging, involving both mendicant orders.

Greeks

The Fourth Crusade and Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 changed the context of discussions with the Greek Church over doctrinal differences which otherwise dated back to the ninth century. The Latin Church had long held that the pope was the supreme authority in the church, not, as the Greeks believed, the first among equals; but after 1204, those taking forward discussions with the Greeks believed they were in a position to dictate doctrine.¹⁴⁷ Lateran IV illustrates the impact of Constantinople's fall on the Latin attitude to the Greeks. Canon four made clear the abhorrence with which the Latin Church viewed what they saw as Greek impiety and disobedience in the context of Greek re-baptisms, while canon five specifically claimed Rome as the 'mother and mistress of all the faithful in Christ'.¹⁴⁸ The seriousness with which successive popes viewed what they perceived as Greek intransigence cannot be overestimated.

However, Greek theology had long influenced Latin thought, for example through Eriugena's translation and use of pseudo-Dionysius.¹⁴⁹ Perhaps the most significant area concerned whether God could be directly seen or known and if so, how: the issue in article one of the condemnation.¹⁵⁰ Greek theology emphasised God's incomprehensibility and embodied a fundamental mysticism.¹⁵¹ In contrast,

the Latin tradition sought more actively for how humans could achieve the ultimate goal of some kind of face-to-face vision of God.¹⁵²

Moreover, while the two traditions developed separately, this happened gradually, and the Greek Fathers, many of whose works were available in translation, had long been considered by the Latins as equal or near-equal to their own. Twelfth-century Latin theologians quoted extensively from both Greek and Latin Fathers. Their sources included Gratian's twelfth-century *Decretum*, where seven per cent of the Fathers cited were Greek; the *Glossa ordinaria*, which cited various Greek authors in the patristic glosses; and Abelard's *Sic et non*, the prologue to which set out rules for using patristic authorities, their potential errors and how to reconcile them, with Pope Gelasius' fifth-century decretals on authentic books, many by the Greek Fathers, appended. Finally, Peter Lombard's extensive use of patristic authors, including the much revered John Chrysostom (†407) and John Damascene (†749), and the controversial and partially banned Origen (†254), was highly influential.¹⁵³ The Greek theological outlook thus permeated Latin thought, consciously or unconsciously. Indeed, respect for the Greek Fathers continued long past the 1241/4 condemnation.¹⁵⁴ Thirteenth-century theologians would have been fully aware of this joint tradition which the condemnation, while not outlawing, certainly approached more divisively.¹⁵⁵

Major debates aimed at doctrinal reconciliation were held between the two sides, in particular at Nicaea, 1234, involving both Franciscans (Rodulphus of Reims and Haymo of Faversham, minister general of the order, 1240–4) and Dominicans (a prior, Petrus of Sezane, and a brother, Hugo). While discussions focussed on a few specific issues, in particular the *filioque* (article three), the *azyma* (communion bread), and, towards the end, purgatory, the new context may have served to harden the Latin stance on the more fundamental difference of approach noted above, whether God could be perceived or known (article one).¹⁵⁶ In contrast to earlier, if uneasy, tolerance, or even ambivalence, by the 1240s Latin doctrine was prepared to assert that God's essence could be seen, repudiating the Greek view. This hardening of attitudes could have had some of its roots in the superiority now felt by the Latins over the Greeks, coupled perhaps with concern that the Greeks' views were nevertheless still attracting Latin adherents and frustration that the Greeks had still not accepted their subservience.

There are two areas to consider: first, the *filioque* controversy, given its possible link with article three; and second, the attitude of influential individuals such as the pope, in particular whether this progressed from seeing the Greeks as in error to seeing them as heretical and a danger to the Latin Church. The likelihood that theologians in Paris would not only have known the Greek position but also seen it as a doctrinal threat is relevant to the extent that it could have been a concern in the condemnation.

The *filioque* controversy dated back to the ninth century and figured in numerous subsequent debates between the two sides.¹⁵⁷ The Greeks believed the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone, while the Latins held he proceeded from both the Father and the Son and was the bond of love between them.¹⁵⁸ Until the thirteenth century, Latin arguments against the Greeks had largely centred on two

factual areas. First, they disputed the authenticity of statements by the authorities, in particular the Greek Fathers, with which the Greeks supported their position. Second, they argued that the ruling in canon seven of the Council of Ephesus, 431 (which forbade anyone to write or compose any creed other than that prescribed at the First Council of Nicaea, 325 – in which the Holy Spirit processed from the Father alone – and endorsed and set out in full at the First Council of Constantinople, 381), nevertheless allowed additions to it. In contrast, although these points were also covered in the Greek arguments, they focused as much on logical issues. Conversely, in the debate at Nicaea, 1234, the Latins adopted the more logical approach. Both sides also produced biblical references to support their cases.¹⁵⁹

The 1234 meeting was a Greek initiative, with the Greek team including their patriarch, Germanos II, appointed by Emperor John III Vatatzes, who also attended, and Nikephoros Blemmydes, a scholar and cleric.¹⁶⁰ The Greeks wanted a council, but the friars asserted they had simply come to talk to the patriarch. The Latins wanted to prioritise discussion on the *azyma*.¹⁶¹ However, the Greeks saw the *filioque* as the primary issue, insisting it was debated first. Among various permutations, the Greeks contended that the Latin logical arguments were inappropriate to first principles – Christ had not used syllogisms in stating that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father. However, the Greeks also used logic, including that if the Father and Son shared the procession of the Holy Spirit, the persons would lose their individuality; and the Trinity was either a single principle, or the three persons, but the dual procession created a duality, making the first principle twofold. These arguments were at the heart of the issues underlying article three and often debated in contemporary Latin texts.¹⁶² The discussions concluded with both sides declaring the other side's views heretical with mutual anathematisation. The Greeks also gave the Latins a letter for the pope and a long statement on the *filioque*.

Shortly afterwards the issue of purgatory, possibly indirectly relevant to article four on the empyrean heaven, was debated, inconclusively and apparently for the first time. The Latins argued purgatory was an intermediate state for the imperfect awaiting judgment between paradise (the immediate place for the just) and hell (where the damned went immediately). The Greeks believed this negated the notion of eternal punishment.¹⁶³

Turning to papal attitudes to the Greeks, Gregory IX's response to the archbishop of Bari, 1231, concerning Greek baptismal practices, shows these had hardened even since Lateran IV (when his predecessor, Innocent III, had banned the Greek practice of re-baptising those baptised under Latin rites). Gregory ruled Greek baptisms to be invalid, stipulating that anyone baptised this way and then ordained must be re-baptised and re-ordained. Since the condemned rite was universal among the Greeks, this invalidated all their ordinations.¹⁶⁴ A further escalation in Gregory's attack on the Greeks came with his 1238 bull, *Postquam Graecorum*, which explicitly accused the Greeks of heresy. It stated:

After the Greek people turned away from obedience to the Roman church, they both encouraged schisms against the same church and degenerated

so from son to step-son and by vain and various bonds of diverse heresies ('vanis ac variis diversarum heresum nexibus') advanced themselves that they infected Greece almost entirely with the thistle of heretical depravity ('heretice pravitatis zizania infecerunt').¹⁶⁵

Richard Spence argues that an attempted expedition sponsored by Gregory, in 1236, to safeguard the Latin Empire in the Holy Land, originally included plans for attacking the Greeks, and that Gregory upgraded the Greeks to heretics simply to bring this attack 'within the definition of the just war', demonstrable as mere pretext since he did not establish the Inquisition there. He believes 'the terms heretic and its canonical baggage were the devices he [Gregory] employed to divest the supporters of heretics ... of their land'.¹⁶⁶ However, given the history of bad blood on both sides over the first three crusades and the precedent of the fourth, such a device seems unnecessary. The schism was real, with the *filioque* a doctrine of substance which Gregory probably saw as heretical, or quasi-heretical – on a par with those of Amaury of Bène and David of Dinant, treated, with their followers, as heretics (or mad). Moreover, other documents establish Gregory's growing exasperation, including a letter to Frederick, again in 1238, comparing the Greeks to asps blocking their ears to warnings to re-join the Church and transgressing orthodoxy. In 1239 he wrote to the Franciscans carrying out conversions in the lands of the 'Saracenorum, Paganorum, et Graecorum, Bulgarorum, Cumanorum, aliorumque Infidelium'. This implied that, by his pontificate's end, he had grouped the Greeks with actual unbelievers.¹⁶⁷ However, establishing the Inquisition against such a long-established sister church was arguably inconceivable.

It is likely that theologians in Paris in the period preceding the condemnation knew something of the debates and issues discussed – many of their works contained specific references to the Greeks. However, what information reached them, when and how, is important in assessing how far the Greek position influenced article three's inclusion in the condemnation. Of the numerous discussions between the Greek and Latin Churches, Anselm of Canterbury's account of the debate at Bari in 1098 was known to Alexander of Hales and others.¹⁶⁸ Further examples likely to have filtered back to the west include a theological debate in Constantinople in 1136 involving Anselm of Havelberg. Anselm later met Pope Eugenius III in 1144 and wrote a report for him, including on the *filioque*, listing, among those attending the debate, 'three wise men skilled in the two languages and most learned in letters, ... James a Venetian, Burgundio a Pisan, and the third, most famous among the Greeks and Latins ... for his knowledge of both literatures, Moses ..., an Italian from ... Bergamo ...'. Burgundio's translations, including those of John Damascene, John Chrysostom and the Greek Church Father Basil of Caesarea (†379), reached theologians such as Peter Lombard in Paris, proving highly influential.¹⁶⁹ The bilingual Pisan, and later cardinal, Hugo Etherianus, was in Constantinople between c.1165 and 1182, following study in Paris. He acted as adviser at the court of Emperor Manuel I Comnenos, engaged in theological discussions, and

wrote a book on the errors of the Greeks, sending copies to Patriarch Aimerikos of Antioch and Pope Alexander III.¹⁷⁰

Second, the Dominicans and Franciscans had extensive contact with the Greeks in the thirteenth century, with the Franciscans establishing bases around Constantinople, such as in Pera, and, before 1261, in Thebes and Corinth in Greece, as well as on Euboea and Crete. Initially the Franciscans were the main group, firmly established in Constantinople by 1220, as demonstrated by references to a 'dilecto filio Fratre Luca magistro fratrum Minorum ...' in a 1220 letter from Honorius III to his legate in Constantinople. The Dominicans were less involved, although they, too, had a base in Constantinople at least from 1234.¹⁷¹ Finally, other groups included monks, with monasteries established in the Holy Land after 1097. The main group were Cistercians, with a first abbey, in Syria, in 1157, and others subsequently, including in Constantinople. In the thirteenth century, the Syrian abbots were required to attend the Chapter-General of the order at Cîteaux every few years. There was also frequent exchange of letters between monasteries. Thus, the abbeys retained their contacts with the northern European houses.¹⁷²

Heretics

Controversy continues over whether an organised group or groups of dualists with a set of defined beliefs existed in the west in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries at all – and, if so, the extent to which they were homogenous either in doctrine or organisation, the degree of their organisation, the extent to which their beliefs were defined, their connection, if any, with eastern dualists, and even what they were called.¹⁷³ This study adopts 'Cathars' as a convenient label, and as used by Moneta of Cremona in his treatise *Adversus Catharos*, without prejudice to the position.¹⁷⁴

Disagreement is perhaps sharpest for the twelfth century and the second half of the eleventh.¹⁷⁵ However, by the time of Lateran IV and probably earlier, even if no such established group or groups existed initially, these had almost certainly emerged with clear doctrines, even if only in reaction to earlier persecution. Either way, given their increasing role in leading and organising doctrine, scholars at Paris writing on the Cathars may well have played a part in the systematisation of Cathar beliefs, whether deliberately or unconsciously. This, in itself, could have influenced the very 'heretical' doctrines they described and attacked, helping to crystallise them, and possibly, by taking perhaps disjointed and unformed views to their logical conclusions, exercising a creative role. However, since the focus of this study is the 1241/4 condemnation and the concerns of those formulating its propositions, the beliefs of theologians at Paris, not what Catharism really was, or its origins, are the issue. Moreover, it appears that, by c.1250, and certainly before 1254, the *Liber de duobis principiis* existed – a significant text composed by one group of self-professed dualists which not merely set out an extreme dualist creed but also exposed differences with a more moderate dualist sect.¹⁷⁶ Thus, even if Catharism was, at its outset, partially a clerical construction,

with Paris theologians involved in this exercise, and perhaps still in their writings indirectly influencing its thinking, well before the condemnation there appears to have existed in substance a dualist doctrine that caused such theologians and the church genuine concern.¹⁷⁷

Historically, Pope Lucius III's 1184 decretal, *Ad Abolendam*, and the third Lateran Ecumenical Council, 1179, heralded increasingly severe measures taken against alleged dualists and other heretics in church decrees and papal bulls, together with punitive action by the German emperors and, from c.1227, the beginnings of the Inquisition. These included Lateran IV's dictates. Scholars at Paris were closely bound up in such efforts from the outset, with the Dominicans' links to Toulouse – the heart of French Catharism – where they were first established, ensuring their anti-heresy agenda was entrenched at Paris from their arrival in 1217. Pope Honorius III's call, also in 1217, to Parisian scholars to go to Toulouse to lecture and preach to bring the people back to God, possibly linked to a petition by Dominic for a school to combat heresy, shows both the close university involvement in tackling heresy and the papal efforts to combat it by any means, intellectual persuasion as well as punishment. The move of Roland of Cremona, the first Dominican theology master at Paris, to Toulouse in 1229, demonstrates the same concern.¹⁷⁸

Theologians at Paris in the run-up to the condemnation were thus well aware of the requirement to rebut dualism. They would have had access to the increasing number of documents produced by those active against the heretics.¹⁷⁹ This does not mean they always focused on current Cathar arguments, rather than simply revisiting discussions of historic dualism, going back to Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, or the patristic authorities he used, especially Augustine.¹⁸⁰ However, the doctrines discussed included those found in contemporary writings associated with thirteenth-century Catharism. Peter Biller's analysis of the discussions of heresy by William of Auxerre (a place where the Cathars had a strong presence and executions took place), provides a case in point. There are textual parallels between William's *Summa aurea* and the *Adversus Catharos* of Moneta of Cremona. This is important as many statements attributed to 'Manichees' by later authors come from William of Auxerre's work. Moreover, William referred to 'Master Prévostin' (presumably the chancellor of Paris, Praepositinus of Cremona) and his time among the Cathars. Indeed, if the attribution of the *Summa contra haereticos* to Praepositinus of Cremona is correct, then a treatise specifically discussing the Cathars (and written by a major university figure) would have been available in Paris in the early thirteenth century.¹⁸¹

Moreover, as is implied by their reported use of Aristotle, together with the complexity of their arguments, many Cathars were not uneducated peasants but presented a real theological threat.¹⁸² Indeed, they may possibly have infiltrated the university itself, although this is far from certain – the only evidence comes from Matthew Paris who noted in 1243, admittedly at second-hand, that the Cathars of Como told Ivo of Narbonne that 'from almost all the cities of Lombardy and some of Tuscany they had sent apt scholars ('dociles ... scholares') to Paris, some to

study the sophistries of logic ('logicis cavillationibus'), others the discourses of theology ('theologicis dissertationibus').¹⁸³

The threat that Cathar doctrines were believed to represent in the first half of the thirteenth century is demonstrated by William of Auvergne, under whose authority the condemnation was issued, in particular in his *De universo*, probably from the 1230s. William devoted all the first part of its first principal part to attacking, under the banner of the Manichees, what he stated 'was and still is not only the most destructive, but also the most pestilential [error], and for this reason [the Christian religion] does not cease to pursue it with sword and fire and to exterminate it right up to today'.¹⁸⁴ His main argument focused on the logical impossibility of two 'coeval and eternal principles', each of them 'necessary' ('necesse esse') through itself and, for this reason, simple in the ultimate degree of simplicity'.¹⁸⁵

The dualist *Liber de duobus principiis* contains numerous passages relevant to the condemnation. It started with arguments in favour of two first principles, or creators, based on logic and biblical quotations. It refuted belief in only one principle, using analogies, such as that a tree could not produce both good and evil fruit. Turning the arguments of its opponents against themselves, it argued that, were there only one principle, God must have created and arrayed his angels freely as he wanted, even though he must have known they could not remain good but would sin, since whatever he foresaw must happen. Hence, God himself must have been the cause and origin of all evil. The argument that this resulted from angelic misuse of God's gift of freewill could be countered: God made angels as they were, and could have made them otherwise. Further arguments included that humans could not succeed by freewill to do anything of which God was not the cause and principle. They had no powers of themselves – all good came from God. But evil did not come from God.¹⁸⁶ These issues were directly relevant to articles five and ten (the angelic and human fall).

In a further argument, again related to article five, the *Liber* asked how angels were able to hate goodness, which existed from eternity, and love its opposite, evil, which did not yet exist, if no separate cause for evil existed – angels would have chosen good, not evil, if evil and Satan did not yet exist. But something that began must have had a cause; and nothing could have an effect before existing.¹⁸⁷ In an intriguing passage, the *Liber's* author stated that a 'Master William', whom it claimed to have heard and described as appearing 'wise in many things' ('sapient in pluribus'), believed:

[A]ngels were not made perfect by God from the beginning, because their God could not make them perfect. The reason for this is that God could not and cannot make anyone like Himself or coequal with Himself ... and although God himself may be called almighty by many, yet this He cannot do ... And thus, in so much as they were inferior to God in beauty and greatness ... these angels could be found wanting to the extent that they could covet His beauty and greatness. So, one reads of Lucifer in Isaiah: 'I will exalt my throne above the stars. I will be like the Most High'. And thus, such a one

would perhaps say that on this account we cannot reasonably blame God for not making the angels so perfect that they could not have coveted His beauty and greatness at all, because their God could not do so ...

The *Liber* suggested another possible argument from 'Master William' would be:

Those who were saved could not covet any more or sin, because they were enlightened and subtly warned by the punishment of the other angels, who became demons through their covetousness.

However, this would mean that the good, holy and just God would have caused his angels to fall and be punished, with no reason or justice, because he could not create them as perfect so that they would not covet his beauty, and they were created earlier than the other angels who saw their example and so did not fall. This was inconceivable for a good God.¹⁸⁸ William's identity is unknown; he may be fictitious, but if some Catholic theologian really argued in this way, undermining God's omnipotence, then it suggests rebutting Catharism was pushing some 'wise' people into dangerous counter-arguments.

Book II of the *Liber* turned to creation, with arguments relevant to article eight. It noted that its opponents might contend that its earlier arguments were invalid, alleging that they were based on human views and philosophy, not the Bible, which only referred to the one true God and claimed he created all things. In refutation, it argued that the words 'create ('creare')' and 'make ('facere')' had three meanings in the Bible. First, God created when he added something to those already good to help those destined for salvation. Thus 'to create' or 'to make' meant to do this from something, as from some pre-existing matter. Second, 'to create' meant when God added to those who had become evil to help them reform. Finally, it meant when God allowed an evil person to do something which would be impossible otherwise, and thus was said 'to make' the evil which he permitted under sufferance, so that he could punish the wicked and reward those to whom he showed mercy. In this sense, Satan and evil could be said to be created by God. Hence God did not directly and completely create evil, still less do so from nothing, which the *Liber's* opponents claimed 'to create' meant.¹⁸⁹

The *Liber* also contained a compendium for the instruction of beginners. This argued against 'the faith of the ignorant' who believed the vision of God (article one) was possible on earth, using the same conflicting biblical quotations as theologians at Paris preceding the condemnation.¹⁹⁰ Part of a Bogomil text, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, could also be relevant to article one (and perhaps article four, the empyrean heaven). Its second half, *The Vision of Isaiah*, reached the west in Latin translation around 1200.¹⁹¹ It described Isaiah's vision of the levels of the heavens, from the first (lowest) to the seventh (highest). Isaiah progressed through each, escorted by an angel. In the seventh, he saw some of 'the righteous who, stripped of fleshy robes, were in heavenly robes and standing in great glory ...'. Isaiah saw there the archangel Michael, and 'the Lord in great glory', and 'another most glorious one, like unto Him in all things' ... the 'angel of the Holy Spirit'.

All glorified Him 'whose glory I [Isaiah] could not behold ... And the angel said to me: "He is the One Living Eternal, living in the highest eternity and resting among the holy ones; we cannot endure to name or see Him ..."'.¹⁹²

Finally, not in the *Liber*, an argument attributed to the Cathars since at least Alan of Lille was potentially relevant to article four. Alan alleged they believed all human souls were fallen angels, that 'the apostate souls, who fell from heaven, are infused into human souls by God's permission, so that they may do penance therein'. They supported this with biblical texts: Mt. xv.24 – where Christ says 'I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel', interpreted as the fallen angels; and Jn iii.13 – 'No man has ascended to heaven, but that he descended from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven'. The texts were seen to imply that only the spiritual (angelic) aspects of humans would be saved.¹⁹³

Numerous polemical and other anti-heretical texts also discussed Cathar views, in particular Cathar belief in two first principles and their theories on creation (article eight). These discussions reflected many points from the *Liber de duobus principiis*, often accurately. For example, Rainerius Sacconi noted that John of Luigo, leader of a second group of Albanenses, believed 'to create is to make something from some pre-existent matter ... never to make from nothing'. Rainerius cited their belief that 'all creatures exist from eternity, good creatures with the good God and evil with the evil God, together with the *Liber's* three meanings of create. Creators do not precede creatures in eternity except causally. Creatures are from God from eternity, like the splendour or rays of the sun which does not precede its rays in time, but only as cause or by nature'.¹⁹⁴

A further persistent allegation in anti-heretical texts (and reflected in Rainerius' *Summa*) was that absolutist dualists 'do not believe that either the Son or the Holy Spirit is God by nature, but each is only a creature of Almighty God. They also believe the Father is greater than the Son and different from Him and the Holy Spirit in substance, and the Son is greater than the Holy Spirit and different in substance'. This was indirectly relevant to article two. The 'mitigated' dualists agreed with the 'absolutists' on the hierarchy in the Trinity, but believed that the Son and the Holy Spirit were God by nature, denied by the first group. Moneta of Cremona further described the absolutist Cathar doctrine on the Holy Spirit itself, together with the spirit and the soul. He argued the Cathars distinguished 'between soul and spirit', and also between the Holy Spirit (*spiritum sanctum*), the Spirit Paraclete (*spiritum paraclitum*), and the Perfect Spirit (*spiritum principalem*). Of these,

they call each spirit which ... God the Father gave to those [heavenly] souls as custodian a holy spirit ... The Paraclete they call the consoling spirit ... The Perfect Spirit they say is the Holy Spirit. To Him they believe they refer in the words: 'We adore the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit'. ... [T]hey call Him greater than all other holy spirits and ... designate Him as Perfect. They declare that He is of such ineffable beauty ... the angels desire to look upon Him.¹⁹⁵

Anti-heretical texts also discussed Cathar views of heaven, relevant to article four. Rainerius Sacconi noted that the Church of the Cathars of Concorezzo believed that the Virgin Mary's soul and those of the apostles and of all the saints 'are not yet in glory, nor will they be until the Day of Judgment, but are in that ether, in the same place as the body of Jesus Christ'.¹⁹⁶

Many of the points in such polemical texts also appeared in positive terms in lists of scriptural passages collected for sermons warning against dualist teachings or for face-to-face disputations with heretics. For example, a *Summa against Manichaean heretics*, c.1225–50, contained correct doctrines including: 'the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one substance and one God' (article two); 'God, who is triune in person and one in essence, is the creator of all things ...' (articles two and eight); and 'no man hath seen God at any time', and '... God appeared to Abraham and spoke to him...' (article one).¹⁹⁷

Jews

The timing of the examination of the Talmud in Paris and its condemnation and burning in the early 1240s, contemporaneous with the 1241/4 condemnation, with the same people involved in both, appears too close to be entirely coincidental. The question is whether this merely reflected a climate of increasing apprehension and conservatism in Paris in the face of doctrinal threats or the theological issues in each were linked.

Following an approach by a Jewish convert, Nicholas Donin, to Gregory IX, with thirty-five charges of vilification of Christian beliefs, the pope wrote to William of Auvergne in June 1239, asking him to transmit various letters to numerous archbishops and kings requiring them, if the allegations were true that the Jews had supplanted the Old Testament with the Talmud and thus continued 'obstinately perfidious', to seize all the books of those in their districts and hand them to the Dominicans and Franciscans. A further papal letter to William and the priors of the Paris Dominicans and Franciscans followed later in June, ordering them, if the allegations were true, to burn any books with such errors. A formal disputation before Louis IX and Blanche of Castille took place in Paris in June 1240. The Latin dossier on the event, compiled later in the 1240s by order of Odo of Châteauroux, now a cardinal, recounted that 'all the books of the Talmud were collected throughout France and taken to Paris' and burnt (probably in June 1241, although other dates, including 1244, are candidates).¹⁹⁸ Thus, the Jewish episode took place in exactly the same period as the 1241/4 condemnation, with the formal Jewish disputation preceding it, and the examination of Jewish documents possibly falling into the period between its two impositions (if the hypothesis of a double imposition is correct).

William of Auvergne and Odo of Châteauroux, then chancellor, together with the masters of the theology faculty, who included Dominicans and Franciscans, formulated the 1241/4 condemnation. The initial papal correspondence from Gregory IX on the Talmud condemnation and burning involved William, and the Talmud was referred to the Franciscans and Dominicans for examination.

Moreover, when Pope Innocent IV took up the issue in 1244, his letter to Louis IX identified William and the doctors teaching theology in Paris as burning the Talmud alongside various other texts with all their glosses. After Innocent's change of heart in 1247, there was subsequent correspondence between Odo, then papal legate, and the pope, with Odo identifying himself as heading the original inquiry. Finally, Odo led a further formal condemnation of the Talmud in 1248, with counter-signatories including William of Auvergne and various Franciscan and Dominican theology masters (including Albertus Magnus).¹⁹⁹

There are three areas to consider. The starting point is the Paris disputation itself, for which we have fairly full, although not impartial and very different, accounts, from both Christian and Jewish sides.²⁰⁰ The main focus in respect of specific aberrant doctrines appears to have been alleged attacks on Christian beliefs about Jesus and Mary. However, even if the wording in the Talmud was objectionable, Jewish views on such beliefs were well-known, and why a text long established in the Jewish world suddenly became a serious target for condemnation is unclear, notwithstanding the accusations made against it by Donin and, more generally, rising antagonism against the Jews.²⁰¹ The only alleged Jewish belief listed which could be relevant to the 1241/4 condemnation was that Eve lay with the serpent and Adam with animals and with Lilith and sired demons, possibly implying creative powers, which could indirectly relate to articles eight (creation) and ten (Adam's fall).²⁰² But any connection is tenuous at most.

Second, there are the texts examined subsequently. These included the Talmud itself – it is likely that its examiners looked at the whole text, not just, as probably for the disputation, Donin's accusations.²⁰³ It also included other Jewish texts. However, it appears the texts translated into Latin and listed by the Christian side consisted primarily of the Talmud or commentaries on it, and liturgical texts.²⁰⁴ While, therefore, those studying the Talmud and associated texts would have been aware of other Jewish works, the texts they considered may have been limited, although they may have included some of Maimonides' works.²⁰⁵

This links to the third area, whether Maimonides' works (with their possible relevance to the 1241/4 condemnation) contributed to Christian concerns over the Talmud. Apart from their possible inclusion in the mendicant investigation, there was also, probably, an incident at Montpellier, c.1232, where two of Maimonides' works (the *Guide for the Perplexed* and the *Book of Knowledge*) were allegedly condemned and burned by the Dominicans and Franciscans.²⁰⁶ This was instigated by elements of the Jewish community in southern France who were apparently divided over Maimonides, with some denouncing his works as rationalist and leading to heresy. A leading anti-Maimonidean there, Rabbi Solomon ben Abraham, had secured some anti-Maimonidean measures from rabbis in northern France. However, he encountered opposition in Provence and Spain, and hence sought Christian support. The documents on this are almost entirely from pro-Maimonidean sources and possibly highly embellished, with critical facts in doubt. However, it seems likely that some such incident occurred. For example, a contemporary circular letter to Jewish communities in Spain from the rabbis of Lunel and Narbonne described the 'heretical evil-doers of Montpellier'

as collaborating with the Baal of Peor (a reference to the Christian God from Num. xxv:5). The letter continued:

For they turned to men of power and deceit; they went to the deceiving Minorites, the squeaking and gibbering Preachers. Scoffing ... they revealed to them the hidden secrets of the Torah, and they turned over the holy books for burning at the hands of the Christian authorities.

Other contemporary Jewish letters described Solomon urging the Christians to exterminate Jewish heresies like Christian ones, and burn Maimonides' books, referring again to the Franciscans and Dominicans.²⁰⁷ While the Talmud was not itself part of the incident, Maimonides' works may have been viewed as Jewish by the mendicants involved, rather than philosophical, and the distinctions between the different Jewish texts may have been blurred.

However, it seems improbable that the church simply accepted the Jewish request and condemned Maimonides' books without its own reasons, perhaps drawn from the Jewish accusations.²⁰⁸ A letter from a Jew, Samuel ben Abraham, in c.1245, argued that a misreading of the *Guide* had led Jews unjustly to maintain that Maimonides denied demons existed (a misreading apparently also in the Latin text). Another accusation concerned prophecy, where, in a later Jewish/Christian debate in Barcelona in 1267, Nahmanides, a Spanish rabbi and scholar, alleged that Maimonides had reduced the historic nature of the Bible to dreams and imaginings, and had argued that angels could be seen with real, albeit special, vision, unconnected to prophetic vision. Angelology was at the heart of medieval Christian theology and Maimonides' views went against Christian beliefs.²⁰⁹ In the context of the condemnation, allegorical interpretation of Genesis was inconsistent with the literal focus of article ten.

But the controversy over the Talmud, and over Maimonides' works if linked, should not be seen in isolation from concerns over Judaism more generally – the Talmud's condemnation was a critical milestone, suggesting that the early 1240s saw a crystallisation for Christian theologians of concerns over Jewish biblical exegesis, and, as with the Greeks, an increasing tendency to view this as connected to, or even approaching, heresy.²¹⁰

There are two strands to Christian perceptions here. First, contacts between Jews and heretics could have fuelled suspicions. These were limited, but there is evidence that Jews were aware of heretical doctrines linked to Christianity.²¹¹ For example, a thirteenth-century French Jewish polemicist attacking orthodox Christianity on the grounds that God entered a woman or was overcome by men, i.e. they had power over him, referred explicitly to Christians becoming Albigenians and Bogomils out of shame.²¹² Moreover, Jacob ben Reuben's *Milhamot HaShem* (*The Wars of the Lord*), written in southwest France c.1170, appears to contain elements of Catharism. It took the form of a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, with the Christian offering two philosophical arguments against Judaism from a 'friend' called Paul. The first concerned the Jewish belief that God existed and created everything, so must be the principle of both good

and evil, a Cathar argument applying to both Christians and Jews and suggesting Paul might have been a heretic trying to subvert Christianity while pretending to focus on Judaism.²¹³ The second argument had a possible read-across to article seven (eternal truths). Its theme resembles that underlying some discussions by thirteenth-century Paris theologians on the issues underlying article seven and is worth full citation:

Paul ... said: I ... know ... the Jews believe in him who is the Lord, God, Almighty, true, and living ... Now, I know ... he is not true by partaking of truth, so that truth would be something other than [him] ... The creator ... is not that way. Rather, his essence is truth ... and the same is true of all the names that apply to him. Moreover, we certainly know that the principle of strength is not merciful, and the principle 'merciful' is not strength, and the principle of life is not truth; even though truth cannot exist without life, life exists as a principle without truth. Thus, each of them is a principle in itself, and each one is the basic essence of the creator ... Since this is so, it follows that the one in whom you believe is more than one, for his basic essence includes all these things. Now, there is no one who does not believe that he is the Lord, God, Almighty, merciful, compassionate, and living; and each of these is a principle in itself. This is the truth.

This argument applied to both Christianity and Judaism. Its appearance in Jewish work, ostensibly a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, could again be a covert attempt by Cathars to undermine Christianity – in this case Christian Trinitarian belief, with multiple principles replacing the three persons – through their contacts with the Jews.²¹⁴

The second strand is Christian perceptions of Jewish views as approaching the heretical themselves. The first half of the thirteenth century witnessed an increasing tendency to portray Jewish views in this way. Such linkage can be seen in various Christian texts and art.²¹⁵ Theologians classifying Jews next to heretics as damned include Odo of Châteauroux, involved in both condemnations, who preached at the university at Paris in 1231 that 'through craftiness the world conquers heretics, Jews, and Gentiles', and, in another sermon in 1231, compared heretics, Jews, Gentiles and lustful people to the animals excluded from Noah's ark.²¹⁶ Comments by William of Auvergne – again involved in both condemnations – demonstrate a possible progression in thought. In *De universo*, dating from the early 1230s, William argued that, apart from a few Jewish philosophers in Muslim territories, the Jews had been led astray from their faith by their rabbinic tradition and fables. However, a few years later, in his *De legibus*, he argued they had been led into heresy by Aristotelian philosophy, a point reflecting how the various different strands of external influences on Christianity could be conflated, at least for polemical purposes, under one pejorative umbrella of 'heresy', albeit remaining discrete.²¹⁷ This sort of thinking could well have coloured the way the contents of the documents examined by the mendicants were viewed and interpreted – they were deliberately looking for evidence of thinking that approached

the heretical. As regards art, the *Bible moralisée*, an illuminated Bible made for Louis IX of France, c.1225, and therefore of particular interest given Louis' role in the Talmud trial, included identifiable Jewish figures depicted as heretics or pagans, evidently equating the two groups, as well as random references to Jews and heretics together.²¹⁸ Maimonides' assertions that 'man's shortcomings and sins are all due to the substance of the body...', and that 'it was necessary that the very noble form of man, which is in the image and likeness of God, ... should be joined to the substance of dust and darkness, the source of all defect and loss', could both raise the spectre of Catharism with its condemnation of the body.²¹⁹

Finally, medieval heretics, in particular Cathars, often used the Bible to justify their own views. Jewish apparent misinterpretations of the Bible could thus well also have been seen in a similar light.²²⁰ However, although Gregory IX clearly took Jewish issues seriously, of the 6,183 letters he issued, only forty-six dealt with the Jews, and only four of these related to the Talmud investigation. Similarly, for Innocent IV, of his 8,352 letters, thirty-two referred to the Jews, and, of these, fewer than four related to the Talmud. It therefore seems likely that any possible identification of Jews with heretics was kept alive and fostered by the Dominicans, Franciscans and Paris theologians rather than by the popes themselves.²²¹ This view is supported by Innocent IV's change of heart in 1247. It also suggests that, by the 1240s, Paris theologians saw themselves as their own masters, a conclusion relevant to the context for the 1241/4 condemnation.

The condemnation of the Talmud in Paris in the 1240s thus marked a significant change of approach to Jewish literature from a previously hostile, but more permissive, position – that works such as the Talmud were wrong, but ultimately a Jewish issue.²²² The thirteenth century was the first period when the church, led by the mendicants, systematically examined Judaism and rabbinic literature and attempted publicly to prove it undermined the Old Testament, and potentially threatened Catholic faith.²²³ This formed part of a broader, concerted attempt to eradicate erroneous ideas, apparently seen by some as an unholy trinity of Judaism, Catharism and philosophy. However, while the increasing tendency to view Jews as in a group alongside heretics is an important context for the 1241/4 condemnation, indicating the kind of hardening of attitudes behind it, specific connections between the Talmud examination and the ten articles are slender or non-existent, although if Maimonides' *Guide* was part of the subsequent examination the linkages could multiply.

Conclusion

While, apart from the physical threat, the Muslims and Mongols primarily represented an opportunity for conversion rather than a doctrinal danger, Greeks, Cathars and Jews all posed doctrinal threats but in different ways. Jews and Greeks threatened the proper interpretation of the Old and New Testaments respectively. For the Cathars, the questions they posed, in particular the origin of evil, were real ones which had troubled Christians since Augustine and earlier. Such issues, and those such as the procession of the Holy Spirit and the vision of God, with the

differing Latin and Greek views, were inherent in Christianity itself, irrespective of any external influences, and hence any contrary views from outside Catholic doctrine were doubly unhelpful, if a unified Catholic position was to be secured.

Moreover, in assessing influences behind the condemnation, whatever the particular issues posed by each group, one critical point must be the linkage between Greeks, Jews and Cathars in the mind of the pope and of Paris theologians. Both Greeks and Jews appear increasingly to have been linked with heretics, at least in polemical texts, both political but also doctrinal, and all three groups were seemingly also linked with philosophers. The cumulative weight, and perhaps confused connections, must be seen as part of the context behind the decision to ensure Paris theologians adhered to the emerging Catholic orthodoxy in their thinking – and hence, also in their teaching, preaching and missionary work.

Conclusion

The 1241/4 condemnation reflects what could be described as a ‘confusion’ of doctrinal influences from numerous different sources, both internal (from Augustine onwards), and external (not just Neoplatonic or just Aristotelian). Some, such as the early Greek philosophers, informed both the internal debate from the outset and also the new learning, coming in via the twelfth- and thirteenth-century translations of texts not previously available. Distinctions between different philosophies were blurred, with some Neoplatonic views accredited to Aristotle. Groups such as Greeks, Jews and heretics, and indeed Muslims, also drew on such sources. Their arguments were not in the context of Catholicism, but their metaphysical and logical arguments were often compelling and applicable to Catholic doctrines. The issues were long-standing; but the unacceptable conclusions drawn on them by those outside the Catholic faith using common philosophical arguments may well have increased their apparent threat. In particular, Cathar dualism brought to the fore the process of creation and number of creators, the role and powers of angels, where evil originated and who would merit reward in heaven – issues directly or indirectly underlying articles five to ten. Greek beliefs on the Trinity and also the knowability of God highlighted the issues in articles one to three. Finally, Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament was seen as tainted and dangerous. All three groups used sophisticated arguments which needed to be countered. This doctrinal mixture formed the context for the condemnation.

However, the organisational influences and events were equally important. This was a period of change and uncertainty, seeing the development of new bodies, including the universities and the mendicant orders, and the embracing of the externally focussed agenda of the early reformers. Critically, the university at Paris was a different place in the 1240s from its beginnings at the start of the thirteenth century and indeed earlier. It was shaped by events leading to and following 1215 and Lateran IV, including escalating concern over heretics and the beginning of the Inquisition, together with increasing frustration with Greek intransigence and the Jews. How the university’s theologians – seculars, mendicants and other orders – saw their roles and their mission in the face of these

concerns, and how they related to each other and to major figures, in particular the pope, directly affected their actions, not least in the aftermath of the 1229–31 strike and *Parens scientiarum*. Such developments form part of the explanation for the condemnation's issue in 1241/4. It also provides the backdrop for conjecture on who might ultimately have been its specific instigator – the pope; the masters collectively, wishing to cement their authority and put their own house in order; the Dominicans, conscious that their brothers were going astray and needed to be checked; or individuals – William of Auvergne, concerned over the apparent increasing credence given by theologians to dangerous views and exerting his authority as bishop, or Odo of Châteauroux as chancellor, seeking to cleanse doctrine from ungodly and erroneous speculation.²²⁴

Chapter 4 aims to link the individual articles in the condemnation, and its overall formulation, with the possible doctrinal and institutional influences identified in Chapter 3, through the analysis of contemporary Latin texts. Lateran IV had established clear doctrinal principles, but different interpretations were still manifold in 1241/4, with some now viewed as unacceptable. Lateran IV's statement of faith in 1215, reiterated in Gregory's decretals in 1234, was the product of the same threats to doctrine as existed in the 1240s, but the intervening period had seen their escalation and thus the need for the development of a more detailed orthodoxy. This, together with organisational influences internal to the university, provided the immediate historical context for the condemnation.

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 Gregory's period as Cardinal Legate supports such continuity. He undertook extensive diplomatic work under both Innocent III and Honorius III, including action against heresy in Italy in 1221. Gregory's heavy involvement in the affairs of both preceding popes, and their confidence in him, made his own papacy the third in an unbroken policy succession, from before and including Lateran IV.
- 2 While the official 'Albigensian Crusade' against the group called 'Cathars' in the Languedoc and surrounding areas, started by Pope Innocent III in 1209, had concluded in 1229 under the treaty of Paris-Meaux, local organised resistance continued until the fall of Montségur, 1244.
- 3 For the dispute with Frederick II, see D. Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (London, 1988).
- 4 For the Mongols, see P. Jackson, *The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410* (Harlow, 2005). For the Crusades, see P. Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades* (London, 2006).
- 5 For example, albeit later than the 1241/4 condemnation, Roger Bacon thought it possible that the Mongols were Gog and Magog, and would thus serve the Antichrist in the days before the Apocalypse and on the Day of Judgment (M.T. Abate, 'The Reorientation of Roger Bacon', in A. Classen (ed.), *East Meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 555–6; A. Power, *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 173–5). See also Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv, pp. 345–6, on apocalyptic events in 1244. For apocalyptic speculation generally (including

- Innocent III's use of Joachim of Fiore's apocalyptic exegesis following the fall of Constantinople in 1204, Jacques de Vitry's interest in apocalyptic prophecies, and the continuing influence of Joachim of Fiore), see B.E. Whalen, *Dominion of God* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009), especially pp. 74–99, 134–43, 149–52; F. Schmieder, 'Christians, Jews, Muslims – and Mongols', *Medieval Encounters*, 12 (2006), pp. 274–95. For Gregory IX's accusation against Frederick II, and whether this was merely rhetorical, see Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor*, p. 318. For evidence of the apocalyptic traditions of Muslims and Mongols in the thirteenth century, see D. Cook, 'Apocalyptic Incidents during the Mongol Invasions', in W. Brandes and F. Schmieder (eds.), *Endzeiten* (Berlin, 2008), pp. 293–312.
- 6 For the ecumenical rulings, see J.W. Smith, 'The Trinity in the Fourth-Century Fathers', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 109–22.
 - 7 For the Cathars, including the modern controversy over their existence, see below, pp. 85–6. References to heresy and heretics throughout this study should be read with the caveats there.
 - 8 For Peter the Chanter's reform agenda, see J.W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970), i, pp. 315–43. For Lateran IV's continuing importance, see A. Duggan, 'Conciliar Law, 1123–1215', in W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (eds.), *History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1244* (Washington, 2008), p. 342; A. García y García, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and the Canonists', in Hartmann and Pennington (eds.), op.cit., p. 370. Immediate recognition of its significance is shown by its three contemporary commentators, Johannes Teutonicus, Vincentius Hispanus and Damasus Hungarus.
 - 9 However, within the overall historical context those involved must have had their own interests and agenda. Older theologians could have been directly influenced by much earlier events. W.J. Courtenay, *Teaching Careers at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1988), pp. 32–3, argues that the ranks of theology masters were dominated by senior, secular masters.
 - 10 *CUP*, i, no. 20, pp. 78–80; I.P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris* (Cambridge, 2012), p. 100.
 - 11 The role of theologians as preeminent interpreters of scripture was distinguished from the pope's power over the church. Gratian, *Decretum*, ed. E. Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879–81), i, p. 65, distinction 20, described Christ as giving two keys to Peter, one of power, one of knowledge. For the symbolic significance of the key of knowledge for the important status of theologians, see J.C. Wei, *Gratian the Theologian* (Washington, 2016), p. 58.
 - 12 Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants*, pp. 18, 99, 103.
 - 13 Odo saw preaching as essential to restore the church and Christian world, urging students to concentrate on scripture, not philosophy. Theologians expressing similar views included John of La Rochelle (†1245), whose *Summa de vitiis* set the goal for theology students to edify themselves first, then others – anyone studying with different goals sinned (S.E. Young, 'Queen of Faculties' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ph.D. thesis, 2009), p. 34). William of Auvergne's treatise on preaching demonstrated the importance given to this skill. William advised cautious use of philosophy, but warned that it should be subordinated to theology (M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230–1231* (Paris, 1931), pp. 123–4). See also S.C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University* (Stanford, California, 1985), pp. 231, 220, 110–111; A. Charansonnet, 'L'université, l'Eglise et l'Etat' (Lyon University, Ph.D. thesis, 2001), pp. 53–64.
 - 14 *CUP*, i, no. 3, pp. 62–3.
 - 15 *CUP*, i, no. 25, pp. 83–4.
 - 16 See, for example, Wei, *Intellectual Culture*, pp. 247–355; S.E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 168–207. Young

- (pp. 206–7) notes an approach by a group of women to a Paris theologian, Raoul of Châteauroux, in 1273, for moral advice following a sermon.
- 17 In the context of political theory, J. Miethke, ‘Practical Intentions of Scholasticism’, in W.J. Courtenay and J. Miethke (eds.), *Universities and Schooling in Medieval Society* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 214–5, notes that members of all faculties at a medieval university were well equipped to respond to society’s interests and needs when theoretical clarification was needed on political matters – every member could define critical contemporary problems with a theoretical approach from his own point of view and respond accordingly.
 - 18 The Primitive Constitutions of the Dominican Order, ratified in 1228, stated that the order was founded from the beginning ‘ob predicationem et animarum salutem’ (C. Linde, ‘An Introduction to Sources and Perspectives’, in Linde (ed.), *Making and Breaking the Rules* (Oxford 2018), p. 4).
 - 19 Gerard de Frachet, *Lives of the Brethren*, trans. P. Conway (London, 1955), pp. 155–6; *BF*, i, pp. 27–300; A.P. Roach, *The Devil’s World* (Harlow, 2005), p. 101, 130.
 - 20 The first Dominican ‘studia’ were at Toulouse. When Dominic dispersed the friars in 1217 to widen their mission, he targeted university towns. Seven friars went to Paris and recruited students there, facilitating the order’s entry to the university and bringing with them their anti-heresy agenda (M.M. Mulchahey, ‘*First the Bow is Bent in Study*’ (Toronto, 1998), pp. 912, 24–36). The Dominican General Chapter acted as a major information exchange centre (L.J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011), p. 55). Thus all Dominicans should have known about current concerns.
 - 21 D.J. Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon, c. 1167–1276* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 188–93.
 - 22 The history of St.-Jacques was critical in the order’s developing relationship with the university: the Dominicans’ move to Paris in 1217 was facilitated by the theology master, John of St. Albans, who – in a move made official in 1221 – offered them the convent of St.-Jacques in return for reciprocal concessions, including its use for John’s theology lectures (Mulchahey, ‘*First the Bow*’, pp. 26–7). The condemnation’s formal convocation may have taken place at St.-Jacques (see above, p. 25).
 - 23 According to Mulchahey (op.cit., pp. 351–2), many Dominican scholars were ‘at the universities, but not of the universities: they operated in proximity to the secular *studia* but were not technically part of them’. Most Dominicans only studied for around three years and most Franciscans for around four years, unless taking a degree (D.L. D’Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 134–5). For Dominican ‘studia generalia’ and the universities generally, see Mulchahey, op.cit., pp. 351–78. For the complex relationship between the Franciscan ‘studia generalia’ and the universities, see N. Şenocak, ‘The Franciscan *Studium Generale*’ in K. Emery et al. (eds.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia* (Turnhout, 2012), pp. 221–36.
 - 24 For the use of the universities generally by the popes and how they engaged them in their service, see P. Classen, *Studium und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1983), p. 292; J. Miethke, ‘Die Kirche und die Universitäten im 13. Jahrhundert’, in J. Fried (ed.), *Schulen und Studium* (Sigmaringen, 1986), p. 314. For the constant papal engagement with the university, extensively recorded in the *CUP*, see W.H. Principe, ‘The School Theologians’ Views of the Papacy’, in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 88–9.
 - 25 Notably, several of Gregory’s appointments as cardinals had studied at Paris, including Rinaldo Conti di Segni (later Pope Alexander IV), appointed 1227, who was at Paris before 1221, and Jacques de Vitry, appointed 1228, who studied under Peter the Chanter (‘The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church’, <https://webdept.fiu.edu/~mirandas/consistories-xiii.htm> (7 May 2016)). Arguably, therefore, the pope’s priorities met those of the university.

- 26 For example, Gregory instituted an inquiry into William of Auvergne's handling of a licence in 1237, with a further letter on this in 1238 (*CUP*, i, no. 115, pp. 161–2, no. 121, p. 166). For William of Auvergne, see Appendix C.
- 27 *CUP*, i, nos. 69–71, pp. 125–9, no. 75, pp. 133–4.
- 28 *CUP*, i, no. 79, pp. 136–9. See also no. 82, pp. 140–1, no. 87, pp. 143–4, no. 95, p. 147. *Parens scientiarum* was designed to encourage the university to transform into a body focussed on preaching and helping the church with its pastoral role (Wei, *Intellectual Culture*, pp. 102–10). For a translation of *Parens scientiarum*, see *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, trans. L. Thorndike (New York, 1975), pp. 35–9.
- 29 *CUP*, i, no. 111, p. 159.
- 30 For the grant of a university master as a papal privilege and Gregory's utilisation of such privileges as part of a strategy for centralisation, see M. Crossnoe, 'Education and the Care of Souls', *MS*, 61 (1999), pp. 137–72, 153–4. Jacques de Vitry, when a cardinal under Gregory IX, saw monastic pastoral functions as better suited to the canons regular (he included the Dominicans in this group), the Franciscans and the secular clergy (J. Bird, 'The Religious's Role in a Post-Fourth-Lateran World', in C. Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden, 1998), p. 218).
- 31 For Gregory's particular commitment to monastic reform, see Crossnoe, 'Education and the Care of Souls', pp. 156–63.
- 32 Gregory's decretals defined the 'generally binding nature of a papal constitution' (E.A. Reno, 'The Authoritative Text: Raymond of Penyafort's Editing of the Decretals of Gregory IX (1234)' (Columbia University, PhD thesis, 2011), pp. 524–9). The decretals (i, 2) contained Joachim of Fiore's condemnation, reproduced from Lateran IV, prefaced by a statement that the union of the three persons is true, 'non collective seu similitudinaria' (*Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX*, i, 2, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals1.html> (2 January 2017)). This brought to the immediate attention of its 1234 readership the issues topical in 1215 in Joachim's thinking, with its possible link to the 1241/4 condemnation (below, pp. 61–2). See also G. Silano, 'Of Sleep and Sleeplessness', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 353–6.
- 33 Below, pp. 90–1. Gregory's attitude appears ambivalent. Jews were a protected group and Gregory frequently supported them. However, his 1234 decretals gave canonical force to the doctrine of 'perpetua servitus iudeorum'. Gregory reissued the *Constitutio pro Iudaeis* (Pope Callixtus II's measure from c.1120, repeated with minor variations by numerous popes), with statutory protections for Jews provided they had not plotted against Christian faith (*Decretalium*, v, 6, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals5.html> (2 January, 2017)); Auvray, i, no. 1159, p. 658; S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (New York, 1966), pp. 5, 35, 81, 92–4, 144, 219).
- 34 See D.J. Moczar, 'From Hugolino Conti to Gregory IX' (George Mason University, PhD Thesis, 1990), pp. 102–13, 118, 122–3.
- 35 Auvray, i, no. 54, pp. 27–30. P.D. Diehl, 'Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy', in S.L. Waugh and P.D. Diehl (eds.), *Christendom and its Discontents* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 55–8. The specification of Lateran IV as the authority, as late as 1227, again demonstrates Gregory's reliance on it, seventeen years after its enactment.
- 36 Auvray, i, no. 142, p. 79; Avicenna, *Opera* (Venice, 1508), fol. 5^v (cit. B. Smalley, 'Gregory IX and the two faces of the Soul', in Smalley, *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning from Abelard to Wyclif* (London, 1981), pp. 117–20). Gregory's letter to Frederick weaves together references to the two faces of the soul as its two powers with biblical references. If the latter are removed, the resultant text follows Avicenna's theory of the soul from his *De anima* (Smalley, op.cit.).
- 37 For Gregory's reading of Greek patristics, see, for example, his reference to Gregory Nazianzus in a letter written when cardinal ('Analecta Heidelbergensia',

- E. Winkelmann (ed.), *Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria*, 2 (Rome, 1879), Varietà ii, pp. 363–7). I am grateful to Brenda Bolton for this reference and her translation.
- 38 *CUP*, i, no. 54, p. 110. Michael Scot was the main source of translations from Arabic in the first half of the thirteenth century.
- 39 *CUP*, i, no. 79, pp. 136–9 (*Parens scientiarum*); no. 11, pp. 70–1 (*Sens*).
- 40 *CUP*, i, no. 87, pp. 143–4.
- 41 *CUP*, i, no. 86, p. 143.
- 42 *CUP*, i, no. 79, pp. 136–9.
- 43 L. Bianchi, 'Aristotle as a Captive Bride', in L. Honnefelder et al. (eds.), *Albertus Magnus and the Beginnings of the Medieval Reception of Aristotle in the Latin West* (Münster, 2005), pp. 777–94. See also *CUP*, i, no. 20, pp. 78–80, no. 59, pp. 114–6.
- 44 *BF*, i, pp. 27–300.
- 45 Mansi, xxii–xxiii.
- 46 Auvray, i–iv. Of those entries that might demonstrate Gregory's interest in education or the dissemination of doctrine, the Dominicans have well over 300. This number includes entries on their presence in various countries and on the running of the order. The Franciscans, on the same basis, have around 125. There are around 180 references to heretics, heresies and directly related issues, around 150 on Constantinople, and around 45 on the Greeks.
- 47 Vercelli was founded from Padua University in 1228 (J. Verger, 'Patterns', in H. de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1992), i, p. 53).
- 48 However, Gregory's strictness on Aristotelian learning for Paris – in contrast to Toulouse and Oxford, which he apparently ignored, despite concerns over heresy at Toulouse – still suggests wider vigilance.
- 49 *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 230–1; Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, p. 32.
- 50 While article one and Lateran IV might seem to conflict, Latin theologians could argue that seeing God's essence did not detract from his ineffable, incomprehensible nature: when interpreted properly, seeing did not mean understanding.
- 51 For the variations in ordering between manuscripts, see below, pp. 246–7, 249, n. 33. The variations do not affect the overall argument on the condemnation's consistency with Lateran IV.
- 52 Eriugena, Amaury, Joachim and Gilbert, and also David of Dinant, are discussed further below.
- 53 For early debates on the Trinity, see M. Edwards, 'Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 80–91. For Pelagius, see P. Adamson, 'Freedom and Determinism', in *Cambridge Medieval Philosophy*, i, p. 406. For Augustine, the beatific vision and the Manichaeans, see G.B. Matthews, 'Augustinianism', in op.cit., pp. 86–98. For passages illustrating Augustine's views on divine illumination and their medieval interpretation, see L. Schumacher, *Divine Illumination* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 4–16.
- 54 For when the ban was first imposed, see A.J. Braid, *Mysticism and Heresy* (York, 2011), p. 199 (below, n. 61). For the *Periphyseon*'s transmission to, and influence on, scholars up to c.1200, see J. Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 67, 97–8, 111–5; J.J. O'Meara, *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 198–211, 216. While apparently less read in the tenth and eleventh centuries, its appearance in library catalogues, with multiple new copies and old ones annotated, demonstrates its popularity in the twelfth and early thirteenth. Twelfth-century theologians referring to it included Anselm of Laon; William of Malmesbury (who found it helpful but advised caution, although he requested tolerance for its author where his enthusiasm for the Greeks had caused him to deviate from the Latin Fathers and caused him to be thought a heretic); Honorius Augustodunensis;

- and Hugh and Richard of St. Victor. See also B. Hauréau, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique* (2 vols., Paris, 1872), i, pp. 26–7; H. Bett, *Johannes Scotus Erigena – a Study in Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1925), pp. 170–96. John O'Meara, op.cit., p. 216, describes the 'pre-Scholastic era' as the 'Golden Age of the Eriugenian influence', arguing: '[By] the beginning of the thirteenth century the *Periphyseon* was well known in circles of serious study'.
- 55 *CUP*, i, no. 50, pp. 106–7 (nos. 11–2, pp. 70–3, cover Sens and Amaury of Bène). 'Ignotas' here could mean ignorant or strange, or imply both.
 - 56 The preface to Bishop Tempier's 1277 condemnation includes some citation of first and last lines (R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 Mars 1277* (Louvain, 1977), pp. 13–4). However, 1225 may be a precedent. For a translation of the 1277 preface, see *Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, eds. J. Parens and J.C. Macfarlane (Ithaca, New York, 2011), pp. 322–3.
 - 57 Alexander of Hales, or one of the Franciscan *Summa theologica*'s co-authors, writing sometime after c. 1236, referred to the *Periphyseon* in terms suggesting he had read it and was aware of Eriugena's theory of ideas/primordial causes (*Summa*, ii, Q.2.a.43, p. 52). He asked 'An creari sit aliquid creatum ut medium inter Creatorem et creaturam'. The 'contra' argument stated: 'Omne quod est, aut Creator aut creatura; ergo super vacuum est ponere medium inter haec, immo pro damnata haeresi habetur in concilio Senonensi quod dicitur in libro *Periphyseon*, in quo dicebatur quod ideae erant medium inter Creatorem et creaturam; ergo "creari" non debet poni medium'. Compare Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, iii, pp. 172–3, section 683A: '... deinde ex primordialibus causis, quae medietatem quamdam inter deum et creaturam obtinent, ...'. For the *Periphyseon*'s reception after 1225, see I.P. Sheldon-Williams' commentary (Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, i, p. 24). No manuscripts were produced after 1225, but over six percent of the *Periphyseon* was still read, as anonymous glosses or attributed to Maximus the Confessor, himself translated by Eriugena, or to pseudo-Dionysius, and they indirectly influenced Albertus Magnus and Aquinas.
 - 58 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, i, pp. 52–3, section 449A.
 - 59 The three heresies were: (i) pantheism, where Henry paraphrased Eriugena as saying 'it is not easy to deny that the creature and the Creator are one' (Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, ii, pp. 12–3, section 528B); (ii) 'that the primordial causes, which are called ideas ('idee'), that is, form or exemplar ('forma sive exemplar'), create and are created' (op.cit., ii, pp. 204–9, sections 615D–618A); (iii) that 'after the consummation of the age, there will be a reunion of the sexes ...' (op.cit., ii, for example, pp. 22–3, section 533C).
 - 60 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, i, p. 9. G.C. Capelle, *Autour du décret de 1210: III, Amaury de Bène* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 16, Paris, 1932), pp. 93–4, contains the full text of the record of Henry Hostiensis' entry. For other texts referring to Amaury and linking him to Eriugena, see Capelle, op.cit., pp. 89–111; J.L. Gieseler, *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1853), iii, pp. 298–300. The allegation of pantheism may be unjustified (D. Moran, *The Philosophy of John Scotus Eriugena* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 88–9). However, Eriugena's statements that, for example, 'we ought not to understand God and the creature as two things distinct from one another, but as one and the same', for 'both the creature, by subsisting, is in God' and 'God, by manifesting Himself, ... creates Himself in the creature' (*Periphyseon*, iii, pp. 160–3, section 678C), appear to substantiate the accusation, or at least to be sufficient to be viewed as pantheistic in the thirteenth century. See also Bett, *Johannes Scotus Erigena*, p. 176.
 - 61 Recent scholarship has questioned the alleged link between Eriugena's and Amaury's doctrines as well as the possible inclusion of the *Periphyseon* in a ban at a Council of Sens (Braid, *Mysticism and Heresy*, pp. 198–9). The only candidate for this is the Archbishop of Sens' decree after the Council of Paris in 1210, which dealt with the Amalricians and also David of Dinant but, like Lateran IV itself, did not refer to

- Eriugena. Be that as it may, Eriugena's condemnation was bound up, directly or indirectly, with Amaury's, and also David of Dinant's (and perhaps also with Joachim, by Amaury's association with Joachim in Lateran IV).
- 62 For the influence of Greek theology and the Greek Fathers on twelfth-/thirteenth-century Latin theologians, see below, pp. 81–2, 111–2, nn. 149–55.
 - 63 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, i, pp. 52–7, sections 449A–450C. See also pp. 48–9, sections 447B–C.
 - 64 Op.cit., ii, pp. 142–3, section 589B, pp. 202–3, section 615A.
 - 65 Op.cit., ii, pp. 88–9, sections 564C–565A, pp. 166–97, sections 599B–612D.
 - 66 Op.cit., ii, pp. 204–7, sections 615D–617A.
 - 67 Op.cit., ii, pp. 80–3, sections 561B–562A; iii, pp. 78–9, section 642A. For Eriugena's possibly offensive use of allegory, see below, p. 147.
 - 68 CUP, i, no. 11, pp. 70–1 (Council of Paris), no. 20, pp. 78–80 (the university's statutes); *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 231–3. For a possible identification of Mauricius with Avicenna, see Braid, *Mysticism and Heresy*, pp. 262–70. Gabriel Théry, *Autour du décret de 1210: I, David de Dinant* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 6, Paris, 1925), p. 10, suggests papal favour may lie behind David of Dinant's omission from Lateran IV. For analysis of the works covered in the 1210 and 1215 prohibitions, see A. Bertolacci, 'On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's *Metaphysics*', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics* (Berlin, 2012), pp. 213–7.
 - 69 An anonymous *Liber de vera philosophia* may be where Joachim encountered Gilbert's Trinitarian theories (M.-D. Chenu, 'Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale en Occident au XIII siècle', in *Melanges Auguste Pelzer* (Louvain, 1947), p. 166). For the differences between Gilbert's and Joachim's views, see F. Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy', *JEH*, 48:1 (1997), p. 30. See also L.O. Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982), p. 60.
 - 70 *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 230–1. The identification of the *De essentia seu unitate Trinitatis* and whether it is part of the *Psalterium* remains uncertain (Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition', p. 26). For earlier discussion of the attribution of *De essentia* to Joachim, see M.W. Bloomfield, 'Joachim of Flora: A Critical Survey', *Traditio*, 13 (1957), pp. 254–6, 260–4, 271–3, 285–6. Although previous scholars have seen the *Psalterium* as generally conformist, Fiona Robb argues cogently that Joachim's attack on Peter Lombard in the *Psalterium* demonstrates his disagreement went beyond misunderstandings or semantics (Robb, op.cit., p. 23, 29). Although Joachim supported the dual procession, often mentioning the Greek dispute, some scholars believe he followed Greek tradition in starting his understanding of the Trinity with the three persons as one essence, rather than the converse (E.R. Daniel, 'The Double Procession of the Holy Spirit', *Speculum*, 55 (1980), pp. 469–72); others, such as Robb (op.cit., p. 30) disagree. See G. Geréby, 'Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 204–6, for the difference between the Greek and Latin approaches. Before Lateran IV, interest apparently centred on Joachim's historical biblical exegesis, but an anonymous 1220s poem, and a 1230s reference by Roger Wendover (in the context of Lateran IV), show interest after 1215 in his Trinitarian views (M.W. Bloomfield and M.E. Reeves, 'The Penetration of Joachim into Northern Europe', *Speculum*, 29 (1954), pp. 772–93). For Gilbert's views, see below.
 - 71 Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (2 vols., Cologne, 1851), i, pp. 304–7; *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, trans. W.L. Wakefield and A.P. Evans (New York, 1969), pp. 259–63; CUP, i, no. 12, pp. 71–2; Braid, *Mysticism and Heresy*, pp. 154–68.
 - 72 Théry, *David de Dinant*, pp. 126–45; Braid, *Mysticism and Heresy*, pp. 257–60. For Albertus Magnus, see below, p. 165.

- 73 Gilbert's Trinitarian views were vehemently opposed by Bernard of Clairvaux and he was forced to recant them partially following two councils (or their subsequent consistories) before Pope Eugenius III, at Paris in 1147 and at Rheims in 1148. However, he appears never to have rewritten the offending passages.
- 74 Catholic doctrine limited the notions to five. For the origin of the discussion, see S.M. Hildebrand, 'The Trinity in the Ante-Nicene Fathers', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 105–6. The early Christian Tertullian (†c.240) established important definitions and distinctions within the Trinity. He described the three persons ('personae'), the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as three 'not in condition ('statu'), but in degree ('gradu'), not in substance ('substantia'), but in form ('forma'), not in power ('potentia'), but in aspect ('specie'); yet of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power' (*Against Praxeas* 2, cit. Hildebrand, op.cit.). Most Latin theologians in the twelfth and first half of the thirteenth century held that relation distinguished the persons. However, some held instead that it was the origin of the persons that distinguished them, i.e. the Son's generation by the Father and the Holy Spirit's procession from both – thus relations became the result of the differences between the persons as established by their origins, not their principle (G. Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2010), p. 122). The predominant Dominican view in the later thirteenth century relied on relation to distinguish the persons, while the Franciscans favoured emanation, although neither denied the dual procession (R.L. Friedman, 'Medieval Trinitarian Theology from the Late Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries', in Emery and Levering (eds.), op.cit., p. 198).
- 75 Boethius, *Quomodo substantiae* (*Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy*), trans. H.F. Stewart, E.K. Rand and S.J. Tester (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973), pp. 40–3; Boethius, *De Trinitate* (op.cit.), pp. 8–13, 16–31; J. Marenbon, *Boethius* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 66–95. Boethius listed the ten categories that can be universally predicated of all things: 'substantia', 'qualitas', 'quantitas', 'ad aliquid ('relation')', 'ubi', 'quando', 'habere ('condition')', 'situm esse ('situation')', 'facere ('activity')', 'pati ('passibility')'. But, as a substance, God is 'ultra substantiam'. The other predicates do not apply, anyway as accidents – God is not a subject and accidents cannot apply to him. But relation is not a predicate in the same way – it does not change anything in its subjects. So, for the Trinity: 'substantia continet unitatem, relatio multiplicat trinitatem'. Hence, only terms belonging to relation may be applied singly and separately. See also J. Marenbon, 'Boethius: From Antiquity to the Middle Ages', in Marenbon (ed.), *Medieval Philosophy* (London, 1998), pp. 11–28.
- 76 One of Abelard's purported heresies was that the Holy Spirit was not from the same substance as the Father and Son (C.J. Mews, 'The Lists of Heresies Imputed to Peter Abelard', *Revue Bénédictine*, 95 (1985), pp. 73–110). Gilbert Crispin (†1117) highlighted the problem of the difference in form ('species') between the Holy Spirit, on the one hand, and the Father and Son, on the other: 'Quaerunt aliqui de spiritu sancto, non id an deus sit: nam omnes Christiani credunt quia deus est pater, deus est filius, deus est spiritus sanctus: sed qua relatione seu habitudine sanctus spiritus dicatur patris et filii esse spiritus. quicquid enim id quod est alterius dicitur esse, aliqua specie habitudinis ab eo necesse est id quod esse. sub persona igitur interrogantes magistri et respondentes discipuli tractetur, quaeso, haec nostra disceptatio' (cit. J.A. Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 70–2).
- 77 Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (*The Major Works*), eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008), p. 393; B.D. Marshall, 'The Deep Things of God', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 403–4, 407–8, 410. Anselm argued: 'unity should never lose its consequences except when a relational opposition stands in the way, nor should the relations lose what belongs to them except when the indivisible unity stands in the way'.

- 78 Lombard, *Sententiae*, i, 33.1, p. 241; *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 231–2. See also Robb, ‘The Fourth Lateran Council’s Definition’, pp. 22–43.
- 79 Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentaries on Boethius*, ed. N.M. Häring (Toronto, 1966), p. 108, paragraph 33, p. 148, paragraph 43. Gilbert argued (op.cit., p. 109, extracts from paragraphs 37–8, p. 147, extracts from paragraphs 38–9) that, when ‘the words “God, God, God” are said’ about each of the three persons respectively, ‘then an enumeration (‘enumeratio’) is made of those who are God: but a repetition (‘repetitio’) of that by which they are God’. In natural things (‘naturalibus’), the ‘quod est’ is one thing, the ‘quo est’ another; but, in theological matters, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are each different (‘alius’), yet they are all one in essence. Moreover, the rules on natural persons, whereby a person could not be part of a person and nothing could be a person unless ‘no other person is what it is by any of those things by which it is itself’ do not apply. For Gilbert’s explanation of ‘proportionate transumption’, i.e. how terms specific to different disciplines, such as theology and physics, may have different meanings specific to each, so the three persons of the Trinity can be one, while three men are three, see J. Marenbon, ‘Gilbert of Poitiers’, in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 343–5, 348. Marenbon notes that Gilbert’s ‘analysis into *quo est* and *quod est* provides a way of explaining the proportion, but only if these are what really constitute things, not just a way of talking about them’.
- 80 Extracts taken from N.M. Häring, ‘A Treatise on the Trinity by Gilbert of Poitiers’, *RTAM*, 39 (1972), pp. 14–50.
- 81 Chenu, ‘Le dernier avatar’, pp. 73–4.
- 82 Gilbert, *Commentaries*, pp. 3–7, 14–5. Bernard complained that people had continued transcribing and reading what Gilbert had condemned with his own lips.
- 83 Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002), p. 326; Douai, MS 434, i, f. 39v; op.cit., ii, f. 74v; P. Glorieux, ‘Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434’, *RTAM*, 10 (1938), pp. 132 (no. 34), 234 (no. 423); William of Auvergne, *The Trinity, or the First Principles*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1995), p. 188, n. 4, pp. 90–1, n. 3. For the Porretani and the School of Chartres, see M.-D. Chenu, ‘Nature and Man – the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century’, in Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society* (Toronto, 1997), p. 31, 36. According to Chenu, ‘Dernier avatar’, pp. 166–7, at the end of the twelfth century the Porretani were a compact, intelligent and determined group, the greatest popularisers of Boethius, Eriugena and pseudo-Dionysius after the school of Chartres, with whom they had a close kinship and from whom they partly derived their inspiration. However, by the thirteenth century the Porretani were no longer an organised group (N.M. Häring, ‘The Porretans and the Greek Fathers’, *MS*, 24 (1962), pp. 203–9), a change perhaps explicable by the passage of time. For Gilbert’s reputation and the use of his works in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see Gilbert, *Commentaries*, pp. 4–13.
- 84 For the issue’s twelfth-century antecedents, see N. Lewis, ‘William of Auvergne’s Account of the Enuntiable’, *Vivarium*, 33 (1995), pp. 113–36, citing Robert of Melun, *Sententiae*, i, 5.57–8, from c.1150: ‘it is possible for there to be many truths even though no things (‘rebus’) at all exist’. John of Salisbury referred, again c.1150, to ‘those forms that the logicians imagine are not dependent on the Creator’; and he looked at the view of some, unidentified, people that certain truths (‘vera’), i.e. ‘enuntiables’ signified by true propositions, were not God nor creature (John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, ed. J.B. Hall, *CCCM*, 98 (Turnhout, 1991), iv, 37, pp. 176–7). For earlier discussion on the truth-value of future statements, going back to Aristotle, see J. Byrd, ‘The Necessity of Tomorrow’s Sea Battle’, *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 48 (2010), pp. 160–7.
- 85 See D.C. Lindberg, ‘The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning to the West’, in Lindberg (ed.), *Science in the Middle Ages* (Chicago, 1978), pp. 52–90; R. McKitterick

- and J. Marenbon, 'Philosophy and its Background in the Early Medieval West', in Marenbon (ed.), *Medieval Philosophy* (London, 1998), pp. 97–108. For the dates of the Latin translations, see 'Aristoteles Latinus', pp. 45–79 (as updated in 'Appendix B', pp. 792–832).
- 86 The fact Richard Rufus almost certainly wrote a commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, probably when in Paris in the arts faculty, c.1235 (see Appendix C), shows arts students were nevertheless reading such works. William of Auvergne, whose own use of the new learning was prodigious, instructed theologians in the 1230s on philosophy's uses: 'But I have digressed ... [to] make clear to you to ... the profundity and truth of philosophical speech, lest you should think it itself is to be spurned, just as is the case for certain stupid fools, to whom it seems nothing has been said wisely unless they have seen it armed in proofs and adorned with rhetorical flourishes, and, what is more foolish, whatever they do not understand, they think an error. Those few things, therefore, which you have heard about such difficult things, so far distant both from your knowledge and your practice, are sufficient for you for now, until you may reach the investigation of the spiritual part of the universe, and until the nature of spirituality is clear to you and its distinctions are named to you, and enumerated, and the relations, then the species, orders, grades, ... and what authentic utterances may contain ..., which are the utterances of the prophets, nay rather, the utterances of ... God, and after this the opinions of philosophers, and also those skilled in occult learning ('magorum')' (William of Auvergne, *De universo (Opera omnia)*, i, p. 649, 1C–D).
- 87 Bertolacci, 'Latin Reception', p. 205. However, Augustine's thought was much more influenced by Plato than Aristotle, with few Aristotelian influences visible in his works (R. Pasnau, 'The Latin Aristotle', in C. Shields (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle* (Oxford, 2012), p. 665).
- 88 According to M.-Th. d'Alverny ('Une rencontre symbolique de Jean Scot Érigène et d'Avicenne', in J.J. O'Meara and L. Bieler (eds.), *The Mind of Eriugena* (Dublin, 1973), pp. 171–2), late twelfth-/early thirteenth-century naturalists were seduced by Eriugena's interpretation of the totality of the universe, both divine and created, using not only Augustine and Boethius, but also the Greek Fathers.
- 89 Pasnau, 'Latin Aristotle', pp. 666–9.
- 90 The only three Platonic dialogues available in Latin before 1241/4 were part of the *Timaeus*, with Calcidius' commentary, and, from the end of the twelfth century, the *Phaedo* and *Meno*, although these two last texts were hardly read, if at all – hence the focus of the following discussion on Aristotle. For Plato, see A. Kenny, *Ancient Philosophy* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 45–64.
- 91 For the dates of translations into Latin for those of Aristotle's works relevant to the 1241/4 condemnation, see 'Appendix B', pp. 793–7: *Sense and Sensibilia*, late twelfth century; *The Soul*, c. 1125–50; *Posterior Analytics*, c.1150; *Metaphysics*, books I–IV, c.1125–30, all books – except XI – c.1220–35; *Physics*, c.1125–50.
- 92 Aristotle, *Sense and Sensibilia*, 6 (Barnes, i), p. 708; Aristotle, *The Soul*, II.7 (Barnes, i), pp. 667. See D.C. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler* (Chicago, 1976), pp. 6–7.
- 93 Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, I, especially 8 (Barnes, i), pp. 122–3; Aristotle, *The Soul*, III.4–8, p. 682–7. For Aristotle's rationale, see P. Adamson, *On Knowledge of Particulars* (Meeting of the Aristotelian Society, 2005), https://www.academia.edu/3197513/On_Knowledge_of_Particulars (5 April 2016), pp. 274–5.
- 94 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII.7 (Barnes, ii), pp. 1694–5.
- 95 Aristotle, *Physics*, I.9 (Barnes, i), p. 328.
- 96 Aristotle, *Physics*, VIII.1, pp. 418–20; J. McGinnis, 'Time and Time Again' (Pennsylvania University, PhD thesis, 2000), pp. 347–58.
- 97 On actuality, see, for example, Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, IX, pp. 1651–61; on causation, *Physics*, II.3, pp. 332–4; see also *Metaphysics*, V.2, pp. 1600–1. *Classical Arabic Philosophy*, eds. J. McGinnis and D.C. Reisman (Indianapolis, 2007), p. xxi.

- 98 The Neoplatonic trinitarian model was already used by twelfth-century theologians, including Abelard, but rejected by Peter Lombard (M.L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (2 vols., Leiden, 1994), i, pp. 254–63). For the background to, and contents of, the *Liber de causis*, see the *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* (Supplément, Paris, 2003), pp. 599–647; T. Gregory, ‘The Platonic Inheritance’, in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 79; P. Pasquale, ‘The University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century’, in S. Gersh (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 276–8; the introduction to *The Book of Causes*, trans. D.J. Brand (Milwaukee, 2012), pp. 4–18. The alternative numbering of the *Liber*’s later chapters reflects differences in the Arab and Latin versions. For the Latin text, see *Liber de causis*, http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost12/DeCausis/cau_libr.html (12 February 2016). The *Liber*’s provenance was disputed from the outset, but since Gerard of Cremona first translated it, it must have been in Arabic. Most extant manuscripts attributed it, or its propositions, to Aristotle. Other attributions included Gilbert of Poitiers, the Arab philosopher al Fārābī (†c.950), Proclus, or a Jew ‘David’. Albertus Magnus (*De causis et processu universitatis a prima causa* (Borgnet), x, 2.1, p. 433) which paraphrased the *Liber*’s second part) saw the author as Jewish, writing in Latin and reassembling extracts from Greek and Arab sources.
- 99 J.A. Aertsen, *Medieval Philosophy as Transcendental Thought* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 201–5. The confusion with Aristotle may have made Latin readers more prone to reading Aristotle through a Neoplatonic lens.
- 100 *Liber*, capitula viii, xv, ii; *Book of Causes*, p. 27 (Ch. 8[9]), p. 33 (Ch. 15[16]), p. 21 (Ch. 2); C. d’Ancona, ‘Pseudo-“Theology of Aristotle”’, Chapter 1: Structure and Composition”, *Oriens*, 36 (2001), pp. 101–2, 106. Leo Sweeney, ‘Doctrine of Creation in *Liber de Causis*’, in C.J. O’Neil (ed.), *An Etienne Gilson Tribute* (Milwaukee, 1959), pp. 282–3, suggests the *Liber*’s position on creation ex nihilo was arguably more helpful to Christian doctrine than its Neoplatonic sources, since, for Plotinus, ‘the production of an item involves two atemporal moments – the *overflowing* of the cause and, secondly, the *self-completion* of that which has overflowed by turning back to its source’; in contrast, while the *Liber* did not refer to ‘creatio ex nihilo’ explicitly, it talked of creation, not over-flowing.
- 101 See d’Ancona, ‘Pseudo-“Theology of Aristotle”’, p. 102.
- 102 *Liber*, capitula ix, xxii; *Book of Causes*, p. 29 (Ch. 9[10]), p. 38 (Ch. 22[23]).
- 103 *Liber*, capitulum xii; *Book of Causes*, pp. 30–1 (Ch. 12[13]).
- 104 *Liber*, capitula xix, xxiii; *Book of Causes*, p. 36 (Ch. 19[20]), pp. 38–9 (Ch. 23[24]). This passage was also potentially relevant to how the ‘First Cause’ could be in all things without multiple eternal things (article seven).
- 105 For the dates of Latin translations, see ‘Appendix B’, pp. 814–22. For transmission of classical and Arab texts to the Latin world, see D. Gutas, ‘Origins in Baghdad’, in *Cambridge Medieval Philosophy*, i, pp. 11–25.
- 106 The translation and use of Avicenna’s works was continuous, with Averroes’ criticisms improving understanding of Avicenna rather than eclipsing him (Bertolacci, ‘Latin Reception’, pp. 199–201). It is probable that, although the original twelfth-century translations of Aristotle were roughly contemporaneous, the apparent loss of much of the translation of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* from sometime in the second half of the twelfth century until 1220–4 meant that Latin theologians/philosophers only had Avicenna’s account (Bertolacci, op.cit., pp. 205–6). For analysis of the translations of Avicenna’s works, see A. Bertolacci, ‘A Community of Translators’, in C.J. Mews and J.N. Crossley (eds.), *Communities of Learning* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 37–54. For the gradual transition in Latin thought from the 1250s onwards from accepting Avicenna’s interpretation of Aristotle to that of Averroes, see A. Bertolacci, ‘Averroes ubique Avicennan persequitur’, in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna’s Physics and Cosmology* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), pp. 397–431.

- 107 Bertolacci, 'Community of Translators', pp. 51–2.
- 108 J. McGinnis, *Avicenna* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 172–7; M.E. Marmura, 'Some Aspects of Avicenna's Theory of God's Knowledge of Particulars', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 82 (1962), pp. 299–312.
- 109 Avicenna, *The Metaphysics of the Healing*, trans. M.E. Marmura (Provo, Utah, 2005), p. 285; this work formed part of Avicenna's major work, *Kitab al-Shifa* (*Book of the Cure*).
- 110 Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 287–90, 417; K. Lim, 'God's Knowledge of Particulars', *Journal of Islamic Philosophy*, 5 (2009), pp. 77–80; Marmura, 'Some Aspects of Avicenna's Theory', pp. 300–2. Earth was included if all things ancillary to it were ignored. Avicenna's view of angels as a single instantiation (Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 288–90, 416, n. 15; McGinnis, *Avicenna*, pp. 175–6) is potentially relevant to article six (angelic location) – when combined with his Neoplatonic-based view of the role given to each intellect, in particular the tenth intellect entrusted with directing things on earth, such a single instantiation must be able to be everywhere simultaneously.
- 111 Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 287–8; Marmura, 'Avicenna's Theory', pp. 309–12; Adamson, *On Knowledge of Particulars*, pp. 289–91.
- 112 For Avicenna, things lacking bodily matter, such as angels, planets and intelligences, were always at any one time the same individual, and a similar argument applied to species, such as humanity, which were made up of particular material individuals but which lacked materiality in themselves (McGinnis, *Avicenna*, p. 174). Most medieval Aristotelian and Neoplatonic Arab philosophers believed that souls lost their individuality after death, with immortality and eternal rewards coming from assimilation to the active intellect (S. Stroumsa, '"True Felicity": Paradise in the Thought of Avicenna and Maimonides', *Medieval Encounters*, 4 (1998), pp. 56, 67, 73).
- 113 Avicenna, *On the Science of the Soul: A Synopsis*, trans. L. Bakhtiar (Chicago, 2013), pp. 12–3, 45–51.
- 114 Avicenna (*De anima*, v, 3.224, cit. *Classical Arabic Philosophy*, p. 193) stated the difference between souls is 'due to what receives the essence, or that to which the essence is properly related, and this is the body'. However, the Latin translation of Avicenna referred to accidents when discussing individuation, and Averroes' criticisms implied this was Avicenna's view. Early thirteenth-century Latin theologians apparently either interpreted Avicenna correctly – in his *De universo*, William of Auvergne (*Opera omnia*, i, p. 852, 2H-853, 1A) stated that Aristotle, al-Fārābī and Avicenna all agreed that 'all diversity, all number from matter, is due to the body' – or never mentioned him in this context. However, some later Latin scholars thought Avicenna believed accidents responsible. For the various thirteenth-century Latin interpretations of Avicenna on individuation, see M. Pickavé, 'On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's Theory of Individuation', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics* (Berlin, 2012), pp. 343, 345–51.
- 115 Avicenna, *De anima*, v, 7.225–6 (cit. *Classical Arabic Philosophy*, pp. 194–5). For analysis of Avicenna's views and how human souls achieve permanent individuation once created, see L.E. Goodman, *Avicenna* (Ithaca, updated edition, 2005), pp. 127–8: 'Individual human souls have an origin and are individuated by the fact of their creation. Their distinct histories give them an individuality that they can never shed'. See also Schumacher, *Divine Illumination*, pp. 90–100. Another potential problem for Avicenna in the individuation of souls was his belief in an infinite number of souls. Avicenna held that such infinity could exist because souls were not ordered spatially or in ontological priority. While this did not prevent souls knowing God, conversely, for God to know individual souls, they would need to be subject to such ordering, since God would need to know the principle of individuation setting each soul apart from other souls, the level of perfection each had achieved and its individual relation

- to other souls – souls would, therefore, need to be organised by their relative value. This would mean there would need to be order within infinity, which Avicenna believed was impossible (Marmura, ‘Avicenna’s Theory’, pp. 309–12).
- 116 Avicenna, *A Compendium on the Soul*, trans. E.A. van Dyck (Verona, 1906), pp. 51–2. This was translated into Latin c. 1160–90, as was Avicenna’s fullest version of his vision theory in *Kitab al-Shifa*, vi, 4 (‘Appendix B’, pp. 818–9). See Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, pp. 49, 234, n. 70, pp. 236–7, nn. 108–11.
 - 117 For its use by William of Auvergne, see below, p. 212.
 - 118 For the possible implications for article six from their single instantiation, see above, n. 110.
 - 119 Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 358–9, 335–7. Avicenna himself never appears explicitly to equate the ‘giver of forms’ with the last of the celestial intelligences, the active intellect, sometimes called the active intelligence or, frequently, agent intellect – terms which all attracted different interpretations. However, such identification is implicit. Thirteenth-century Latin theologians differed in interpreting this equation, and over whether the ‘giver of forms’ (active intellect/intelligence or agent intellect) was a separate substance, as Avicenna himself believed, followed by, for example, the *Summa Theologica* attributed to Alexander of Hales. In contrast, Averroes (*Long Commentary on the De anima*, translated into Latin in the 1220s), argued that both the active/agent intellect and the material intellect were positioned in the soul. Averroes’ views, and Avicenna’s opposite position, were major topics in medieval debate from at least the 1230s, with opposing positions taken by theologians. While Averroes’ position was welcomed initially as an antidote to Avicenna’s, Richard Rufus objected to it. The doctrine was condemned in 1252 by Bonaventure and the English Dominican, later archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Kilwardby – R.C. Taylor, *Averroes*, <http://bartholomew.stanford.edu/authors/averroestext.html> (2 April 2016). Roger Bacon and others identified the active/agent intellect with God. Other theories included that of Albertus Magnus, that forms pre-existed somehow in matter (D.N. Hasse, *Avicenna’s De Anima in the Latin West* (London, 2000), pp. 188, 203–4). The active/agent intellect as an issue in its own right did not feature in the 1241/4 condemnation, but it could have been indirectly relevant to several of its articles. For Roger Bacon (and whether the active/agent intellect figured in William of Auvergne’s two pronouncements of the condemnation), see above, pp. 20–1. See also D.N. Hasse, ‘Avicenna’s “Giver of Forms”’, in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna’s Metaphysics* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 225–49.
 - 120 Averroes, *Long Commentary on the Metaphysics*, vii, 31, xii, 18 (cit. Hasse, ‘Avicenna’s “Giver of Forms”’, pp. 230–2). For the conflation of Avicenna and Plato, see, for example, Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, 7.2.a.2.q.1, *Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72), ii, pp. 418–21, and Albertus Magnus, *Super Dionysium De divinis nominibus*, ed. P. Simon (Münster, 1972), in *Opera omnia* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxxvii, i, chapter 4, p. 194b (both cit. Hasse, op.cit.).
 - 121 Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 300, 417, n. 1.
 - 122 Op.cit., pp. 302–4.
 - 123 Op.cit., pp. 302–6.
 - 124 Avicenna, *Physics of the Healing*, trans. J. McGinnis (Provo, Utah, 2009), pp. 237–8; McGinnis, *Time*, pp. 351–2.
 - 125 Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 272–3; R. Acar: ‘Creation, Avicenna’s Metaphysical Account’, in D.B. Burrell et al. (eds.), *Creation and the God of Abraham* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 77–80.
 - 126 D’Alverny, ‘Une rencontre symbolique’, pp. 171–2; Gregory, ‘Platonic Inheritance’, p. 79.
 - 127 Pseudo-Dionysius and Gregory of Nyssa only figure via the *Periphyseon*, and, while the *Liber* paraphrases parts of *Periphyseon*, i and ii (the primordial causes), with some direct quotations, it only names Eriugena once. Roland de Vaux, *Notes et textes sur*

- l'Avicennisme Latin* (Paris, 1934), pp. 64–140, describes the *Liber* as a ‘mosaic’ and ‘a fraud’.
- 128 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, ii, pp. 82–3, section 561C; de Vaux, op.cit., p. 92, 133.
- 129 De Vaux, op.cit., p. 92.
- 130 De Vaux, op.cit., pp. 128–9, 133–4. The last two lines appear to be borrowed from Eriugena (*Periphyseon*, i, p. 128–9, section 482C): ‘Soluta itaque deus infinitus est; caetera ubi et quando terminantur’. The next two lines explaining the ‘active intellect’ (‘intelligentia agens’) exemplify the *Liber*’s unattributed use of Avicenna (*De anima*, i.5). The misquotation from Augustine is from *Soliloquies*, I, 8.15 (De Vaux, ibid.).
- 131 T.B. Noone, ‘An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum Super Metaphysicam* Book XII, d. 2’ (University of Toronto, PhD thesis, 1987), pp. 78–81.
- 132 Op.cit., pp. 81–2; R.C. Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World’, *Speculum*, 61:3 (1986), pp. 552–3; R.C. Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Treatise *De finitate motus et temporis*’, *Traditio* 19 (1963), pp. 261–2; R.J. Teske, ‘William of Auvergne on the Individuation of Human Souls’, *Traditio*, 49 (1994), pp. 77–93.
- 133 For the agent intellect (or intelligence), see above, n. 119.
- 134 Averroes, *In Physica*, viii, 1 (cit. L.X. López-Farjeat, ‘Aquinas on the Eternity of the World in *II Sent.*’, http://academic.mu.edu/taylorr/Aquinas_and_the_Arabs_Project_Essays/2._Lopez-Farjeat,_Aquinas_on_the_Eternity_of_the_World.html (16 May 2016), pp. 4–6).
- 135 Taylor, *Averroes*, passim. On the difficulties that medieval theologians experienced in the 1230s/1240s in understanding Averroes’ doctrine, see D. Salman, ‘Note sur la première influence d’Averroès’, *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), pp. 203–12.
- 136 For a summary of the early known use of Maimonides’ works and dates of reception in the Latin west, see G.K. Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses* (Würzburg, 2004), passim; G.K. Hasselhoff, ‘Maimonides in the Latin Middle Ages’, *JSQ*, 9 (2002), pp. 6–8, 18; G.K. Hasselhoff, ‘The Reception of Maimonides in the Latin World’, *Materia giudaica*, 1/2 (2001), pp. 258–80. The following account is largely drawn from these works. The first dateable Latin reference to an (anonymous) work by Maimonides, the *Liber de parabola* (mainly containing Maimonides’ explanations of biblical laws) comes in a letter to Cardinal Romanus (who visited Paris in 1229). This can be dated to 1223–4. Michael Scot appears to have known Maimonides’ works. William of Auvergne neither named nor quoted from Maimonides directly, but his *De universo* and *De legibus* include passages echoing him. The *Summa Theologica* attributed to Alexander of Hales refers twice to Maimonides, but his other edited works contain no explicit references. Other Latin scholars naming Maimonides include Roland of Cremona in his *Summa*, c.1233, although his references are imprecise, suggesting he did not have the full text. However, by 1240, the Dominican Moneta of Cremona clearly knew the *Guide*, while Albertus Magnus was the first who can clearly be seen to use Maimonides extensively. Both Moneta of Cremona (*Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T. Ricchini (Rome, 1743), p. 483b) and Albertus Magnus (*De resurrectione*, i, 3, ed. W. Kübel (Münster, 1958), in *Opera omnia* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxvi, p. 244) use the term ‘quidem’ for Maimonides (Albertus cites arguments ‘a philosopho quodam Rabbi Moses’), which may suggest he was not read extensively. The lack of explicit reference to Maimonides by, for example, William of Auvergne and Alexander of Hales, can, however, be explained through convention, because his death in 1204 made him a near contemporary (B. Smalley, ‘William of Auvergne, John of La Rochelle and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Old Law’, in Smalley, *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning* (London, 1981), p. 140). It is, therefore, likely that he was known more widely than the few texts naming him suggest. For Roland and Moneta of Cremona, see W. Kluxen, ‘Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism’, in S. Pines and Y. Yovel (eds.), *Maimonides and Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 1986), pp. 225–6.

- 137 A.L. Ivry, 'The *Guide* and Maimonides' Philosophical Sources', in K. Seeskin (ed.), *Cambridge Maimonides Companion*, pp. 58–81.
- 138 Moses Maimonides, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. M. Friedlaender (New York, 1904), pp. 295–7, 305–6.
- 139 Op.cit., pp. 122, 181–2, 136.
- 140 Op.cit., pp. 224–66, 275–352 (especially pp. 310–3, 347–51), 364–5. Maimonides also, pp. 310–3, criticised Gen. i, 1, 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth', as implying time existed before the creation.
- 141 Op.cit., pp. 479–80. See also pp. 309, 370–2. Maimonides identified 'evil inclination' with imagination, asserting 'all our defects in speech or character are ... the ... work of imagination' (S. Klein-Braslavy, 'Bible Commentary', in *Cambridge Maimonides Companion*, pp. 261–6, 271). For Maimonides' anthropological approach to the Genesis account, see S. Klein-Braslavy, *Maimonides as a Biblical Interpreter* (Boston, 2011), pp. 21–86. For later Latin, and indeed Jewish, concern over Maimonides' approach to angelology, see below, pp. 92, 118, n. 209.
- 142 Maimonides, *Guide*, pp. 171–2, 176–7. Maimonides also commented (pp. 296–7) on Jewish exegetical interpretation of God as plural in the Old Testament, alleging that this referred to God acting with, or in contemplation with, angels. Maimonides criticised this, asserting: 'God acts through, not with, the angelic host'. However, if this kind of wording was in texts examined in Paris in the 1240s (below, pp. 90–1), it could have seemed a dangerous misinterpretation of the Old Testament. Other areas relevant to the 1241/4 condemnation that could have offended Paris theologians include Maimonides' views on the immortality of the individual soul, which he appeared to reject, although some modern scholars question this (A.L. Ivry, *Maimonides' 'Guide of the Perplexed': A Philosophical Guide* (Chicago, 2016), pp. 215–7). Articles one, four and nine all require the soul's immortality.
- 143 Odo of Châteauroux may be an exception to the position on blanket prohibition. In his letter of 1247 to Innocent IV, who had favoured re-examination of the Talmud as it was not wholly to be condemned, and arguing against this position (below, n. 199), Odo cited Jerome's statement that 'there is no perverse doctrine that does not contain some truth'. He argued: 'These are books that contained errors, and hence, no matter how much good they contained, they were nevertheless condemned by the authority of the councils, in the same way that heretics are condemned, although they do not err in everything' (cit. Grayzel, *Church and Jews*, pp. 275–8). See also Odo's connection with the *Periphyseon*'s banning (above pp. 58–9).
- 144 Christian scholars traditionally viewed Jews as guardians of Old Testament interpretation. See G.R. Evans, 'Masters and Disciples', in M. Sæbe (ed.), *Hebrew Bible* (3 vols., Göttingen, 1996–2012), i, pp. 237–60.
- 145 William of Auvergne may have seen the threat from Muslim theology as serious. Discussing Muslim law, he described Macometus' (Muhammad's) views as nonsense and inane (William of Auvergne, *De legibus* (*Opera omnia*, i), p. 49, 2D). Such ridicule may represent an attempt to defuse the peril (L. Smith, 'William of Auvergne and the Law', in T.J. Heffernan and T.E. Burman (eds.), *Scripture and Pluralism* (Leiden, 2005), pp. 138–42). However, this study has found little evidence that their doctrinal threat was seen as comparable to that of the other three groups – concerns over Arab translators seem to have focused on their philosophy.
- 146 For papal views, in particular those of Gregory IX, on Islam as both a conversion opportunity and a physical threat, see E.A. Synan, 'The Pope's Other Sheep', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy* (Toronto, 1989), p. 390. The church's initially optimistic attitude to the Mongols (some believed them Christian, possibly Nestorian, led by the mythical Prester John, and destined to overthrow Muslim power) changed when they attacked Europe, an action that culminated in their invasion of Hungary in 1241. For example, in 1238 Matthew Paris (*Chronica majora*, iii, pp. 488–9) described them as a 'monstrous and inhuman race of men'. Gregory's

diplomatic correspondence with various sultans included a letter to the Almohad Caliph al-Rashid 'to acknowledge the way of Truth' with references to Christian emissaries already dispatched, and he told the sultan of Damascus: 'We ... are obliged to seek the salvation of all' (*Die Beziehungen der Päpste*, ed. K.-E. Lupprian (Vatican City, 1981), no. 7, p. 120, no. 13, p. 124, no. 14, p. 130, no. 15, p. 133 – cit. Synan, 'Pope', pp. 399, 403–4). Entries in the *Bullarium Franciscanum* illustrate Gregory IX's combination of military action and missionary zeal. One, from 1234, urges Louis IX to crusade against the infidels, while numerous entries concern Franciscans travelling to the east, to both Christian and non-Christian areas. For example, in 1238 Gregory gave special rights to Franciscans going to the lands of the Saracens and pagans. The last letter of the series, in June 1241, commended the Franciscans for their suffering for Christ and refers specifically to those 'in excommunicatorum terris' (*BF*, i, no. 148, pp. 141–2, no. 245, p. 231, no. 345, pp. 298–9). Mongols and Muslims were also seen as playing a role in the Apocalypse (above, n. 5).

- 147 For discussion of the differences and growing antagonism between the two churches, see A.E. Siecienski, *The Filioque* (Oxford, 2010), *passim*, especially pp. 123–5.
- 148 *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 235–7.
- 149 Pseudo-Dionysius was probably viewed as much as a Latin authority as a Greek, and, until the twelfth century, was sometimes confused with St. Denis of France (Peter Abelard, *Letters of Peter Abelard, Beyond the Personal*, trans. J.M. Ziolkowski (Washington, 2008), pp. 133–5). For the importance of pseudo-Dionysius in the works of theologians closely associated with Aristotelianism, in particular Albertus Magnus, see A. Speer, 'Lichtkausalität. Zum Verhältnis von dionysischer Lichttheologie', in *Die Dionysius-Rezeption im Mittelalter* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 343–5. For the attraction of pseudo-Dionysian Neoplatonism, as developed by the Greek theologian Maximus the Confessor and by Eriugena, for some Latin theologians, see B. Blankenhorn, *The Mystery of Union with God* (Washington, 2015), pp. 30–46. The Neoplatonic outlook was reinforced in Latin thought in the late twelfth century by the *Fons vitae* of the eleventh-century Jewish philosopher Avicbron, translated by Gundisalvus, and the translation of further Greek works by John Damascene and others (S. Tugwell, *Albert and Thomas* (New York, 1988), p. 47). It was thus embedded in Latin theological debate from before the churches split.
- 150 For the Latin and Greek traditions on the nature of human union with, and hence vision of, God (which remained a central doctrinal dilemma even after the 1241/4 ruling, as an attempt by Pope John XXII to re-open the issue in 1331–3 shows), see Tugwell, *Albert and Thomas*, pp. 39–95, Geréby, 'Hidden Themes', pp. 183–211, H.-F. Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium de la vision béatifique', *RTAM*, 19 (1952), pp. 60–99, P.-M. de Contenson, 'La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle', *RSPT*, 46 (1962), pp. 409–44. See also P.-M. de Contenson, 'Avicennisme latin et vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle', *Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire*, 26 (1959), pp. 29–97.
- 151 Greek theological tradition was not simplistically or slavishly Platonic or Neoplatonic. The fourth-century Cappadocian Church Fathers, and later pseudo-Dionysius, imposed Christian theology onto this while using its concepts and methods. However, an unreachable incomprehensible God, and a distinction between the unknowable essence and the energies or operations that went out from him, remained fundamental to Greek thinking from the Cappadocians onwards (V. Lossky, *The Vision of God*, trans. A. Moorhouse (Aylesbury, 1973), pp. 99–102).
- 152 Catholic doctrine was fluid before the condemnation, although increasingly the position that Augustine seems to have held finally – that God's essence could be seen in heaven though not on earth – was accepted. In 'Ep. 147', Augustine argued that God dwells in 'light inaccessible', with an invisible and unchangeable nature, although after the resurrection we will see him as the angels do, albeit with difficulty; and he stated that he preferred to attribute the vision of God's invisible being 'to clean hearts,

not to bodily eyes, even at the resurrection' (Augustine, *Letters, Volume 3 (131–64)*, trans. W. Parsons, in *The Fathers of the Church* (127 vols., Washington, 1947–2013), xx, pp. 170–224, especially pp. 188, 205, 214, 217). See also Augustine, *De civitate Dei [Concerning the City of God against the Pagans]*, trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003), xxii, 29, pp. 1081–7. For the extent of the permeation and reshaping of Greek apophatic (negative) theology into a more Augustinian mode in Latin twelfth-century thinking – and then carried over into the thirteenth – by for example, Hugh of St. Victor (†1141) and Thomas Gallus (†1246) – see Blankenhorn, *The Mystery of Union with God*, pp. 30–46; and for an example of an attempt to harmonise the two traditions, see John of Salisbury, *Metalogion*, iv.40, pp. 179–81: John states, citing Augustine, that God is best known by not knowing, and that ignorance is the truest wisdom (cit. Tugwell, op.cit., p. 40, who notes that while the first quotation is genuinely from Augustine, 'the second is derived from Eriugena by way of Dionysius', with the same combination of texts also in Eriugena, and that the theology they embody is far more negative than Augustine's own). Thirteenth-century theologians tried to solve the problem of how God can be known (a question approached in largely linguistic terms in the twelfth) by applying the epistemology from the newly translated Aristotelian works and their Arab and Jewish commentators, but this only exacerbated it (Tugwell, op.cit., pp. 44–50). For a contrasting twelfth-/thirteenth century tradition that appears to have 'been entirely unaffected by the epistemological controversies or the condemnation of 1241', see Tugwell, op.cit., pp. 52–5. This 'absorbed Dionysius into an essentially Augustinian tradition, according to which we know God precisely by loving him' (which gives us a 'supra-intellectual "knowledge" of God').

- 153 For the use made of the Greek Fathers by Latin twelfth-century theologians and earlier, see J.-G. Bougerol, 'The Fathers and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 113–64; E.A. Matter, 'The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*', in Backus (ed.), op.cit., pp. 83–111; J. Werckmeister, 'The Reception of the Church Fathers in Canon Law', in Backus (ed.), op.cit., pp. 51–83; B. Pranger, 'Sic et Non: Patristic Authority between Refusal and Acceptance', in Backus (ed.), op.cit., pp. 165–93; M.L. Colish, '... *Quia hodie locum non habent*: Scholastic Theologians Reflect on their Authorities', *Proceedings of the PMR Conference*, 15 (Villanova, 1991), pp. 3–4; A.J. Minnis and A.B. Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 67–9, 87–105. Latin scholars did not develop the traditional group of four Latin Fathers until the early 700s – previously, both Latin and Greek major Christian writers were described as, for example, 'Defenders of the Faith', with varying lists (B.M. Kaczynski, 'The Authority of the Fathers', *JML*, 16 (2006), pp. 2–3, 10–2).
- 154 For example, even in the thirteenth century, the early Greek Church Father, Gregory of Nazianzus (†390), had a major influence on Latin thought (C. Simelidis, *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Göttingen, 2009), p. 60). Aquinas considered Gregory had such great authority that no one ever slandered him; his opinion must not therefore be rejected out of hand (L.J. Elders, 'Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, p. 340).
- 155 For the continuing use of patristic authors by thirteenth-century theologians, see N. Lewis, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Church Fathers', in Backus (ed.), op.cit., pp. 197–229; J.-G. Bougerol, 'The Church Fathers and *Auctoritates* in Scholastic Theology to Bonaventure', in Backus (ed.), op.cit., pp. 289–335.
- 156 The issues relevant to the condemnation were only a small percentage of the total – each side composed lists of 'errors' (T. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists* (Urbana, Illinois, 2000), pp. 1–2).
- 157 The numerous twelfth-century debates over doctrine, the *filioque* in particular, were often acrimonious, with the Latins increasingly present in the east and papal demands

that the unity both churches wanted was contingent on the Greek Church acknowledging the supremacy of the pope and Latin Church (J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1986), p. 168). The period after 1204 formed a continuation of earlier discussions, but the Fourth Crusade had fundamentally changed the balance of power. See also S. Neocleous, 'Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies against the Crusades', *JMH*, 36 (2010), pp. 253–74.

- 158 For the *filioque* debate generally, see Siecienski, *Filioque*, *passim*.
- 159 Patristic and conciliar arguments figured large in, for example, Peter Lombard's twelfth-century discussion of the Greek position, with arguments from logic treated separately. Although Alexander of Hales' 1220s *Glossa* also used arguments from Anselm of Canterbury's *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (written after he attended a debate with the Greeks at Bari, 1098, and dealing with the arguments there), it also kept many of the logical arguments separate. For Anselm's account of the Bari debate, see G.R. Evans, *Anselm* (London, 1989), pp. 41, 60–6. Anselm assumed resolving the issue would need a joint meeting of, and agreement by, bishops on both sides, since their common consent was essential for any conciliar decrees to be official – a position demonstrating a very different negotiating atmosphere to that after 1204. The original Greek arguments were heavily syllogistic – see Photius, *On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, trans. Holy Transfiguration Monastery (New York, 1983).
- 160 Both the full official Latin report of the debate (*Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum*, ed. G. Gulabovitch, *AFH*, 12 (1919), pp. 418–70) and Blemmydes' Greek account (Nikephoros Blemmydes, *A Partial Account, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. Études et documents*, 48 (Leuven, 1988), pp. 106–14) are extant. Exchanges in 1228 between Gregory and Germanus on church unity and the *filioque* suggest that the patriarch saw such theological issues as matters for the papacy itself. Germanus accepted the Holy Spirit proceeded through the Son because all that the Son had, he had from the Father (Mansi, xxiii, pp. 62–6).
- 161 The Latins' prioritisation of the *azyma* suggests they might have felt this was their stronger ground and that they could not counter Greek arguments on the *filioque* (H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church* (Oxford, 2003), p. 241).
- 162 Blemmydes, *Partial Account*, pp. 106–14; Chadwick, *East and West*, pp. 238–43; J. Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400* (New Brunswick, 1979), pp. 42–4, 64–72; N.G. Chrissis, *Crusading in Frankish Greece* (Turnhout, 2012), p. 95; Siecienski, *Filioque*, pp. 125–6.
- 163 Chadwick, *East and West*, pp. 244–5. The Greeks viewed purgation with bodily punishment that offered expiation as an Origenist belief in ultimate salvation for everyone.
- 164 Auvray, i, no. 740, pp. 460–1; T.A. Lacey, 'Gregory IX and Greek Ordinations', *Church Historical Society*, 33 (1898), pp. 3–16. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, xii, pp. 67–8, 3a.Q.66.a.5) later defended Greek baptisms, stating: '[Their] sacrament is validly conferred'. Subsequent popes abandoned the ruling, which was doctrinally dubious. The implications of Gregory's ruling are particularly striking in the light of Catholic doctrine according to which, once baptised, even by a heretic, no-one should be re-baptised if baptised in the name of the Trinity, and that even lay people can baptise in an emergency (see, for example, Lombard, *Sentences*, iv, 6, 1–5, p. 32–6).
- 165 Auvray, ii, no. 4154, p. 918. See also no. 4155, p. 919, no. 4605, pp. 1171–2; N.G. Chrissis, 'The City and the Cross', *BMGS*, 36 (2012), pp. 22–3; R. Spence, 'Gregory IX's Attempted Expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople', *JMH*, 5 (1979), pp. 166–9.
- 166 Spence, 'Gregory IX's Attempted Expeditions', pp. 168–9; Chrissis, 'City and Cross', pp. 22–5.
- 167 Auvray, ii, no. 4110, pp. 902–3; *BF*, i, no. 296, pp. 269–70.
- 168 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 11, pp. 136–7.

- 169 C.H. Haskins, 'The Greek Element in the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century', in Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), pp. 144–5; C.H. Haskins, 'North-Italian Translators of the Twelfth Century', in Haskins, op.cit., pp. 196–209; C.H. Haskins, 'Versions of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*', in Haskins, op.cit., p. 207. See also D.J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962), p. 16; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, pp. 176–7.
- 170 Hugo Etherianus' book included full refutations of Byzantine theologians, for example Photius (from the ninth century), Theophylact of Ochrid (from the tenth) and Nicetas of Maroneia (from the early twelfth), as well as references to works by both Latin and Greek Church Fathers, for example Athanasius, Cyril, Basil and Augustine. His aim was both to provide a patristic basis for the Latin position on the *filioque*, and to answer Greek accusations that the dual procession meant there were two principles (a duality) within the Trinity (Siecienski, *Filioque*, p. 121). Etherianus met Gilbert of Poitiers' disciple, Hugh of Honau, in Constantinople, helping him to obtain Greek patristic documents for Gilbert's case at Rheims (M.-Th. d'Alverny, 'Translations and Translators', in R.L. Benson and G. Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Toronto, 1991), p. 431).
- 171 R.L. Wolff, 'The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans', *Traditio*, 2 (1944), pp. 214, 231; M. Angold, 'Greeks and Latins after 1204', in B. Arbel et al. (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London, 1989), p. 70; M.D. Jordan, 'Theological Exegesis and Aquinas Treaty "Against the Greeks"', *Church History*, 56 (1987), p. 449. See also N.I. Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders in Medieval Greece* (Turnhout, 2012), p. 208.
- 172 Despite the Cistercians' contemplative role, they probably engaged in outside disputes. The popes used them as agents in the crusader states, charging them to bring Greek monasticism into the Catholic faith and to preach the Fourth Crusade (B.M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania 1145–1229* (York, 2001), pp. 71–2). See also A.J. Andrea, *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade* (Boston, 2000), pp. 19–21, 268, 277–8; B. Hamilton, 'The Cistercians in the Crusader States', in *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades: 900–1300* (London, 1979), pp. 405–22; M. Angold, *The Fourth Crusade* (Harlow, 2003), pp. 178–9; A.E. Lester's review of Kienzle, op.cit., *CHR*, 90 (2004), pp. 758–9.
- 173 For a comprehensive account of the modern debate, see A. Sennis, 'Questions about the Cathars', in Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 1–20. See also R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (Oxford, 1987); B. Hamilton, 'Wisdom from the East', in P. Biller and A. Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 38–60; M.G. Pegg, 'The Paradigm of Catharism; or, the Historians' Illusion', in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 21–52; J.H. Arnold, 'The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem', in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 53–78; J. Feuchter, 'The *heretici* of the Languedoc', in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 112–30; B. Hamilton, 'Cathar Links with the Balkans and Byzantium', in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 131–50; R. Rist, "'Lupi rapaces in ovium vestimentis'", in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 229–41; R.I. Moore, 'Principles at Stake: The Debate of April 2013 in Retrospect', in Sennis (ed.), op.cit., pp. 257–73.
- 174 For the earliest known reference to Cathars, see Hamilton, 'Wisdom from the East', p. 46, who cites Egbert of Schönau's 1163 sermon on Cologne Cathars, using the terms 'catharizandus' and 'archcatharus'.
- 175 For example, at one end of the spectrum, Mark Pegg (*A Most Holy War* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 39–40) argues that heresy was created by those in the church, starting from the mid-eleventh century, possibly to meet the need for its existence as a precondition for the apocalypse at a time of intense speculation about the millennium and the end of the world. Pegg cites a French monk, Rodulphus Glaber (†1047) quoting St. Paul that 'there must be heresies ... so that they who are of the faith must be proved'.

In contrast, Peter Biller ('Goodbye to Catharism?', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 288–95) holds that dualist heresy, linked to eastern dualism, had a strong presence in southern France from at least the third quarter of the eleventh century.

- 176 For the manuscript tradition and the date, see *Livre des deux principes*, ed. C. Thouzellier (Paris, 2008), pp. 27–32, *Heresies of High Middle Ages*, pp. 511–2. For discussion of the *Liber de duobus principiis*, see D.L. D'Avray, 'The Cathars from Non-Catholic Sources', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 177–84. See also P. Biller, 'Northern Cathars and Higher Learning', in P. Biller and B. Dobson (eds.), *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 40–9.
- 177 For an analysis of the Dominican Moneta's *Summa adversos Catharos*, see L.J. Sackville, 'The Textbook Heretic: Moneta of Cremona's Cathars', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 208–28. This argues convincingly that, while Moneta's description of the Cathars should not be read back to the twelfth century, irrespective of whether they existed then, this does not apply to the thirteenth century, where Moneta, possibly an inquisitor, 'is describing and refuting what he found on the ground: an intellectually driven, textually orientated, connected group of thinkers'.
- 178 *CUP*, i, no. 25, pp. 83–4; P.O. Lewry, 'Papal Ideals and the University of Paris 1170–1303', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy* (Toronto, 1989), p. 367.
- 179 Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, p. 10. The strong Dominican presence in Toulouse (and indeed the anger their severity against heretics caused there) is also clear from their expulsion in 1235, probably returning in 1236 (The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: *The Albigensian Crusade and its aftermath*, eds. W.A. and M.D. Sibly (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 93).
- 180 Texts such as Augustine's *Contra Faustum* offered ample anti-dualist material to draw on (and could have been partially behind article nine – see below, pp. 174, 189, n. 143).
- 181 Biller, 'Northern Cathars', pp. 25–40, 52–3, compares William's *Summa aurea* with Moneta of Cremona's *Adversus Catharos*, identifying similar descriptions of Cathar doctrines in both, sometimes almost verbatim. Both contain a maxim from Aristotle's *De generatione et corruptione*, unlikely to have been available in Latin before the twelfth century: 'The principles of contraries are contraries' – see Aristotle, *De generatione et corruptione – translatio vetus*, ed. J. Judycka, *Aristoteles Latinus*, 9.1 (Leiden, 1986), pp. 74 (lines 3–20), 75 (lines 6–9). See also William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea*, ed. J. Ribaillier (4 vols., Paris 1980–7), ii, I, p. 172, 168; Moneta, *Adversus Catharos*, p. 23b. For the date of the *Summa contra haereticos*, see Praepositinus of Cremona, *The Summa contra haereticos ascribed to Praepositinus of Cremona*, eds. J.N. Garvin and J.A. Corbett (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1958), pp. xiii–xv. The *Summa contra haereticos* (p. 4) stated: 'Hereticus ... qui hoc dicit, antiquitus Manicheus, nunc vero Catharus appellatur', a derivation also discussed by Moneta, *Adversus Catharos*, p. 411b. Moneta may have included historic arguments, but many of his sources would have been contemporary (*Heresies of High Middle Ages*, p. 307).
- 182 Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, pp. 39–40.
- 183 L. Paolini, 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture,' in P. Biller and A. Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 96; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, iv, p. 271. The restrictions on reading the newly translated works of Aristotle on natural philosophy in 1210 and 1215 may have been partly in reaction to concerns over Catharism (Biller, 'Northern Cathars', p. 49). It is arguable that, had Cathars in fact been present at the university at Paris, their existence would be recorded more fully, and indeed they would have been denounced; but lack of evidence is not a conclusive argument. Given the 1241/4 condemnation did not name the sources for its propositions, no specific references to Cathars would be likely there.
- 184 William of Auvergne, *The Universe of Creatures*, trans. R. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998), pp. 33–4.

- 185 Op.cit., pp. 31–60. Many of William’s arguments mirror those in the dualist *Liber de duobus principiis*.
- 186 *Livre des deux principes*, pp. 160–203. William of Auvergne (*The Universe of Creatures*, pp. 54–7) identified as the first argument ‘which seems to have led the Manichees into error’, ‘that from one of two contraries the other cannot arise’. Responding, he gave examples of both good and evil coming from a single source, such as drunkenness coming from (good) wine, and discussed various Manichaean arguments on the nature of contraries, in similar terms to the *Liber de duobus principiis*.
- 187 *Livre des deux principes*, pp. 203–17.
- 188 Op.cit., pp. 218–22; *Heresies of High Middle Ages*, pp. 531–2.
- 189 *Heresies of High Middle Ages*, pp. 536–44. A further treatise, *Against the Garatenses*, refuted the arguments of the moderate or ‘mitigated’ dualists who believed in one good creator (op.cit., pp. 42, 567–74). *Livre des deux principes*, pp. 228–72, 363–89.
- 190 *Livre des deux principes*, pp. 358–61.
- 191 For Bogomil literature, see *Heresies of High Middle Ages*, pp. 447–9. The text was referred to (c.1222) by Durand of Huesca (formerly a Waldensian), and (c.1240) by the Franciscan Jacopus Capelli and by Moneta of Cremona.
- 192 Op.cit., pp. 449–58.
- 193 Alan of Lille, *De fide catholica*, i, 2; 9 (PL. 210, 308C, 316B), cit. D. Elliott, *Fallen Bodies, Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1999), pp. 142–3, *Heresies of High Middle Ages*, p. 217.
- 194 Op.cit., pp. 307–46, especially pp. 339–40. The argument on causal priority resembles Avicenna’s (above, pp. 73–4). Rainerius, once a heretic, was a Dominican inquisitor by c.1245.
- 195 Op.cit., pp. 310–1, 313, 337–8.
- 196 Op.cit., p. 344.
- 197 Op.cit., pp. 296–300. Denying man’s vision of God may contravene article one, unless limited to earth.
- 198 P.L. Rose, ‘When was the Talmud burnt in Paris?’, *JJS*, 62 (2011), pp. 324–39, argues for 1241. See also J. Friedman, J.C. Hoff and R. Chazan, *The Trial of the Talmud* (Toronto, 2012), p. 22.
- 199 *CUP*, i, no. 131, pp. 173–4, nos. 172–3, pp. 201–5, no. 178, pp. 209–11; Grayzel, *Church and Jews*, pp. 239–43. Odo’s letter to Pope Innocent IV, 1247, stated: ‘I have ... asked the Jewish masters to show me the Talmud and all their other books; and they have exhibited to me five most vile volumes which I shall have carefully examined in accordance with your command’. His judgment in 1248 stated: ‘Certain books by the name of Talmud having been presented by the Jewish masters to us; armed with apostolic authority, we have examined these books and caused them to be carefully examined by men of discretion, expert in these matters ... Whereas we found that these books were full of innumerable errors, abuses, blasphemies, and wickedness ... to such an extent that these books cannot be tolerated ... without injury to the Christian faith, therefore, with the advice of those pious men ... we pronounce that the said books are unworthy of tolerance, and that they are not to be restored to the Jewish masters, and we decisively condemn them. We are also possessed of full knowledge as to the place and time of other books not shown to us by the Jewish masters nor by us examined, although we have often made demands for them; and we shall do what there is to be done with regard to them ...’ (cit. Grayzel, op.cit., pp. 275–8, 278–9). For the interplay between the pope, the king and the university in the Talmud trial and associated events, see Y. Schwartz, ‘Authority, Control, and Conflict in Thirteenth-Century Paris’, in E. Baumgarten and J.D. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France* (New York, 2015), pp. 93–110.
- 200 Friedman, Hoff and Chazan, *Trial of Talmud*, passim. As well as his primary target, the Talmud, Donin also occasionally referred to other post-biblical Jewish

texts to support his case, including the Jewish liturgy, commentaries on the Bible and the Talmud by various rabbis, and homilies on the Bible ('midrashim') (S.R. Eisenberg, 'Reading Medieval Religious Disputation' (University of Michigan, PhD thesis, 2008), pp. 12–3). See also A. Funkenstein, 'Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages', *Viator*, 2 (January 1972), pp. 373–4.

- 201 While Peter the Venerable attacked the Oral Torah in the twelfth century with a new criticism of Jewish preference for the Talmud over the Bible and authentic teachings, he did not link the Talmud with Jewish blasphemy. Donin's attack thus exemplifies a departure in how Christians viewed the Talmud (Friedman, Hoff and Chazan, *Trial of Talmud*, pp. 12–6). There were internal Jewish divisions over the degree of authority of some Jewish works, such as the Talmud, and it appears several converts from Judaism to Christianity worked together to gather evidence for the trial, adding new charges to the ones originally gathered (J.M. Rosenthal, 'The Talmud on Trial', *JQR*, 47 (1956–7), p. 67, 69). For the rising antagonism against the Jews, see below, n. 223.
- 202 Friedman, Hoff and Chazan, *Trial of Talmud*, pp. 46, 123, 164–5.
- 203 Northern Europe Jewish copyists did not see the aim of copying as reproducing the original text, but as an editorial operation, involving amending the text and adding their own interpretations and views (Eisenberg, 'Religious Disputation', p. 19). Hence, the exact text examined is uncertain.
- 204 I. Loeb, *La controverse sur le Talmud sous saint Louis* (Paris, 1881), pp. 4–5; Friedman, Hoff and Chazan, *Trial of Talmud*, pp. 16–7, 93–168. There were two records of the controversy: the Latin (the *Extractiones*), and the Hebrew. The Latin account is in Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16558. The *Extractiones* had two parts: the first grouped the extracts from the Talmud under headings (the Talmud's authority, blasphemies, etc.); the second, whose author was assisted by two Christians, 'very learned in Hebrew' and with Donin probably present, was composed after the Talmud's burning and followed the order of treatises in the Talmud, starting with texts from the Mishna largely related to Jewish law and courts. The Mishna included references to numerous Jewish sages including Eliezer (Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, †c.120). Maimonides' comment, *Guide*, 2.26, pp. 349–51, illustrates the kind of views such documents might have contained which could have caused Catholic alarm. (Maimonides believed Eliezer's views on creation 'would imply an admission of the eternity of the universe, though only in the form taught by Plato', commenting that the passage 'greatly confuses the notions of all intelligent and religious persons. I am unable to explain it sufficiently. I quoted it in order that you may not be misled by it'.) Theobald of Sézanne, a Jewish convert and later Dominican, was probably one of the authors of the *Extractiones*, and the excerpts of Jewish errors that circulated with his copy contain the only known Latin compilation from the commentary on the Bible by Rashi (Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, a leading Rabbinic sage, †1106), probably selected precisely for the purpose of demonstrating Jewish errors (D.C. Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers* (Philadelphia, 2007), p. 50, 16, 153). The second part of the Latin account also included an introduction to, and glossary of, rabbinic literature and terms, ending with documents relating to the trial and the Latin correspondence. See also J. Olszowy-Schlanger, 'The Study of the Aramaic Targum by Christians in Medieval France and England', in A. Houtman et al. (eds.), *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (Leiden, 2014), p. 234; J. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews* (Ithaca, 1982), p. 65. For the sources of Christian knowledge of Judaism generally, see Friedman, Hoff and Chazan, *Trial of Talmud*, pp. 6–8; *The Talmud – A Selection*, ed. N. Solomon (London, 2009), pp. xx–xlix. For Albertus' probable knowledge of the *Extractiones*, as well as Donin's own list of errors, see A. Fidora, 'Albert the Great and the Latin Talmud', in A. Fidora and N. Polloni (eds.), *Appropriation, Interpretation and Criticism* (Barcelona, 2017), pp. 121–36.

- 205 G.K. Hasselhoff, 'The Persian Talmud Trials and the Translation of Rashi's Bible Commentaries', *Henoch*, 37 (2015), pp. 29–30.
- 206 For what follows, see Cohen, *Friars and Jews*, pp. 52–60.
- 207 The letters include references to the papal legate, Cardinal Romanus, whose involvement against the Albigensians indicates his concern over heresy. A late thirteenth-century rabbi, Rabbi Hillel, believed there were only forty days between the burning of Maimonides' works and that of the Talmud, which may demonstrate that contemporary Jews connected the two events – although they are not linked in other records (Cohen, *Friars and Jews*, pp. 53–60).
- 208 J.L. Teicher, 'Christian Theology and the Jewish Opposition to Maimonides', *JTS*, 43 (1942), pp. 68–76.
- 209 Nahmanides' view was similar to that of thirteenth-century Latin theologians, since, by denying the historical nature of Old Testament events, Maimonides undermined the Christian belief that these events foreshadowed the New Testament (Teicher, 'Christian Theology', pp. 70–2). For example, Aquinas explicitly rejected Maimonides' view, that 'all the things that we read in sacred Scripture about apparitions of angels happen in the vision of prophecy, namely, in imaginary vision, sometimes when awake and sometimes when asleep'. Aquinas' reasons included that 'since the Son of God assumed a real body, not an imaginary one, as the Manicheans said, it was fitting that angels by also assuming real bodies appeared to human beings' (Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei*, Q.6.a.7, 'Corpus Thomisticum S. Thomae de Aquino: Opera Omnia', <http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/iopera.html> (30 January 2019), *The Power of God*, trans. R.J. Regan (New York, 2012), pp. 182–3). However, it seems from the defences raised at the Talmud disputation that Maimonides was not alone among Jews in treating some Old Testament stories as non-literal passages.
- 210 Recent research has demonstrated that suspicions of Jewish 'heresy' should be seen in the light of Jewish interactions with Christianity more generally. There was cross-cultural inter-change between Christian, Muslim and Jewish scholars and 'Jewish interactions with the majority culture', not just with Arab philosophy, leading to correlation in their receipt of some philosophical concepts and traditions (A. Fidora, R. Fontaine, G. Freudenthal, J.H. Harvey and Y. Schwartz, 'Studies', in R. Fontaine and G. Freudenthal (eds.), *Latin-into-Hebrew, texts and studies* (2 vols., Leiden, 2013), i, p. 17). Such interchange, and indeed the various trials of Jewish documents, raise questions on the Jewish knowledge of Latin and how and why it might have been acquired, with arguably the need for Jews to argue religious issues with Christians a prime motivation (D.J. Lasker, 'Latin into Hebrew and the Medieval Jewish-Christian Debate', in op.cit., i, pp. 333–47).
- 211 D. Berger, 'Christian Heresy and Jewish Polemic in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Harvard Theological Review*, 68 (1975), pp. 297–303; D. Berger, *Judaism and Jewish Life* (Boston, 2010), pp. 99–100.
- 212 Berger, 'Christian Heresy', p. 297.
- 213 Berger, 'Christian Heresy', pp. 298–300. The *Milhamot* account appears to have represented a real discussion, although with Paul concealing his actual doctrinal position (Berger, *Judaism and Jewish Life*, pp. 99–100).
- 214 Berger, 'Christian Heresy', pp. 300–3. However, the argument could represent a misguided Christian attempt to show Judaism implied the Trinity, although thereby implicitly undermining Christian doctrine as well.
- 215 The Jews had long been suspected of malign influence on other groups. For example (Andrea, *Contemporary Sources*, pp. 115–26), Innocent III wrote in 1204 to the priests accompanying the army to Constantinople, quoting from Joachim of Fiore's *Expositio in Apocalypsim*: '[W]hy is it that the Greeks have not yet learned to believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son just as from the Father. It can only mean that they basely received instruction from the Jewish people ...'.

- See also Berger, *Judaism and Jewish Life*, p. 85; Berger, 'Christian Heresy', pp. 287–303.
- 216 S. Lipton, *Images of Intolerance* (Berkeley, 1999), p. 83; Davy, *Sermons*, p. 201, 182.
- 217 William of Auvergne, *De universo*, pp. 805, 2C–806, *De legibus*, pp. 18, 1G–29, 1H, pp. 46, 1H–47, 1A; William states (*De legibus*, p. 24, 2E–F) 'Hinc est quod facti sunt in lege erronei, & in fide ipsius Abrahae haeretici, maxime postquam regnum Sarracenorum diffusum est super habitationem eorum. Exinde enim aeternitatem mundi et alios Aristotelis errores secuti sunt, multi eorum. Hinc est quod pauci veri Judaei, hoc est, quia non in parte aliqua credulitatis suae Sarraceni sunt, aut Aristotelicis consentientes erroribus in terra Sarracenorum, inveniuntur de his, qui inter philosophos commorantur'. Cohen, *Friars and Jews*, p. 62.
- 218 Lipton, *Images*, pp. 83–8. Theologians may also have believed the Jews corrupted students – the legend of Theophilus, where a cleric sold his soul to the devil through a Jewish sorcerer, was popular c.1220, with the danger of ambition, pride and intellectual independence a frequent warning to students in sermons and elsewhere (Lipton, *Images*, pp. 91–8).
- 219 Maimonides, *Guide*, pp. 430–8.
- 220 Regulation 14 of the Council of Toulouse, 1229 (Mansi, xxiii, p. 197, cit. E. Rembaum, 'The Talmud and the Popes', *Viator*, 13 (1982), pp. 203–24): 'Prohibemus etiam, ne libros veteris testamenti aut novi, laici permittantur habere'. This regulation may well have reflected concern over the development of interpretations of the Bible outside the authorities sanctioned by the church, leading to local lay groups forming around such unauthorised views and asserting their independence from the church. Such developments, particularly given their potential to lead to heresy, disturbed the church hierarchy. The attack on the Talmud was arguably part of this wider picture (Eisenberg, 'Religious Disputation', p. 5).
- 221 Rembaum, 'Talmud and Popes', p. 215.
- 222 Albertus Magnus referred to the Jews now having two laws, written law, i.e. the Mosaic Ten Commandments, according to the Old Testament, and oral law, i.e. the Talmud (Fidora, 'Albertus the Great and the Latin Talmud', pp. 123–6). This idea of a double divinely revealed law must have elevated the Talmud for Christians to a status potentially damaging to Christianity.
- 223 The contrast between Augustine's belief in Jewish ignorance over Jesus' nature in the crucifixion with that of thirteenth-century theologians, especially the mendicants, that the Jews acted in full knowledge that Jesus was the Messiah and Son of God, may also have increased aggression. If the Jews had acted knowing Jesus was the Messiah, then post-biblical Judaism was based on a deliberate distortion of the events in the Bible and its text. The Jews should therefore no longer be treated tolerantly but should be viewed as the greatest danger to Christianity (J. Cohen, 'The Jews as the Killers of Christ in the Latin Tradition, from Augustine to the Friars', *Traditio*, 39 (1983), pp. 1–27). Moreover, an increasing concern with the imminent end of the world and Last Judgment, which the conversion of the Jews to Christianity must precede, may have led to increased fervour and aggression, especially among the mendicants, in confronting the 'errors' of the Jews (Cohen, *Friars and Jews*, p. 76). This concern also extended to other non-Christian groups, such as the Mongols (above, n. 5).
- 224 In *De legibus*, p. 50, 2.E, William of Auvergne expressed strong concern that in his time the strongest and most holy people were viewing the arguments of philosophers, heretics and blasphemers as credible. Reasons for William's concern could include the Fifth Crusade's failure, heresy, Christian attraction to Jewish biblical interpretation and a preference for using dialectic in theology among Paris theologians (Smith, 'William of Auvergne and the Law', p. 127). For Odo's concern over speculative theology, see, for example, C. de Courrèges d'Agnos' analysis of his sermons, 'Sainte Dominique et les Dominicains dans les sermons du Cardinal Eudes de Châteauroux (1190?–1273)' (Lyon University, M.St. thesis, 2014), p. 20.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Manuscript and archival sources

Douai, MS 434.

Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16558.

Printed primary sources

Albertus Magnus, *De resurrectione*, ed. W. Kübel (Münster, 1958), in *Opera omnia... edenda ... curavit Institutum Alberti Magni Coloniense* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxvi.

Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia ...*, ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).

Albertus Magnus, *Super Dionysium De divinis nominibus*, ed. P. Simon (Münster, 1972), in *Opera omnia ... edenda ... curavit Institutum Alberti Magni Coloniense* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxxvii, i.

Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1951–7).

Alexander of Hales, *Summa Theologica*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1924–48).

‘Analecta Heidelbergensia’, ed. E. Winkelmann, *Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria*, 2 (Rome, 1879), Varietà ii, pp. 363–7.

Anselm of Canterbury, *The Major Works*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008).

Aristotle, *De generatione et corruptione – translatio vetus*, ed. J. Judycka, *Aristoteles Latinus*, 9.1 (Leiden, 1986).

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), ii, pp. 1552–728.

Aristotle, *Physics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), i, pp. 315–446.

Aristotle, *The Posterior Analytics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), i, pp. 114–66.

Aristotle, *Sense and Sensibilia*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), i, pp. 693–713.

Aristotle, *The Soul*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), i, pp. 641–92.

Augustine, *De civitate Dei [Concerning the City of God against the Pagans]*, trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003).

Augustine, *Letters, Volume 3 (131–164)*, trans. W. Parsons, in *The Fathers of the Church* (127 vols., Washington, 1947–2013), xx.

Avicenna, *A Compendium on the Soul*, trans. E.A. van Dyck (Verona, 1906).

Avicenna, *The Metaphysics of the Healing*, trans. M.E. Marmura (Provo, Utah, 2005).

Avicenna, *On the Science of the Soul: A Synopsis*, trans. L. Bakhtiar (Chicago, 2013).

Avicenna, *Physics of the Healing*, trans. J. McGinnis (Provo, Utah, 2009).

Boethius, *The Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy – Theological Tractates*, trans. H.F. Stewart, E.K. Rand and S.J. Tester, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. S.J. Tester (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973).

Bonaventure, *Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72).

The Book of Causes, trans. D.J. Brand (Milwaukee, 2012).

- Bullarium Franciscanum*, ed. J.H. Sbaraleae (7 vols., Rome, 1759–1904).
- Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (2 vols., Cologne, 1851).
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Classical Arabic Philosophy: An Anthology of Sources*, eds. J. McGinnis and D.C. Reisman (Indianapolis, 2007).
- The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath*, eds. W.A. Sibly and M.D. Sibly (Woodbridge, 2003).
- Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*, ed. A.J. Andrea (Boston, 2000).
- ‘Corpus Thomisticum S. Thomae de Aquino: Opera Omnia ...’, <http://www.corpusthomicum.org/iopera.html> (30 January 2019).
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., Washington, 1990).
- Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX. Compilatio Liber Primus*, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals1.html> (2 January 2017).
- Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX. Compilatio Liber Quintus*, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/gregdecretals5.html> (2 January 2017).
- Die Beziehungen der Päpste zu islamischen und mongolischen Herrschern im 13. Jahrhundert anhand ihres Briefwechsels*, *Studi e testi*, 291, ed. K.-E. Lupprian (Vatican City, 1981).
- Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum seu Relatio Apocrisariorum Gregorii IX de gestis Nicaeae in Bithynia et Nymphaeae in Lydia 1234*, ed. G. Gulabovitch, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 12 (Rome, 1919), pp. 418–70.
- Gerard de Frachet O.P., *Lives of the Brethren*, trans. P. Conway (London, 1955).
- Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae fratrum*, ed. B.M. Reichart (Louvain, 1896).
- Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentaries on Boethius*, ed. N.M. Häring (Toronto, 1966).
- Gratian, *Decretum*, ed. E. Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879–81), i.
- Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002).
- Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, trans. W.L. Wakefield and A.P. Evans (New York, 1969).
- Hissette, R., *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 Mars 1277* (Louvain, 1977).
- John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, ed. J.B. Hall, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 98 (Turnhout, 1991).
- John Scotus Eriugena, *Periphyseon (De divisione naturae)*; Books I–II, ed. I.P. Sheldon-Williams (Dublin, 1968, 1972); Book III, eds. I.P. Sheldon-Williams and L. Bieler (Dublin, 1981); Book IV, ed. E.A. Jeauneau (Dublin, 2009); Book V, ed. E.A. Jeauneau (Turnholt, 2003).
- Les registres de Grégoire IX, ...*, ed. L. Auvray (4 vols., Paris, 1896).
- Liber de causis*, http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost12/DeCausis/c_au_libr.html (12 February 2016).
- Livre des deux principes*, ed. C. Thouzellier (Paris, 2008).
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83).
- Medieval Political Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, eds. J. Parens and J.C. Macfarlane (Ithaca, New York, 2011).
- Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque ...*, ed. T. Ricchini (Rome, 1743).
- Moses Maimonides, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. M. Friedlaender (New York, 1904).
- Nikephoros Blemmydes, *A Partial Account, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. Études et documents*, 48 (Leuven, 1988), pp. 106–114.

- Peter Abelard, *Letters of Peter Abelard, Beyond the Personal*, trans. J.M. Ziolkowski (Washington, 2008).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano (4 vols., Toronto, 2007–10).
- Petrus Lombardus (Peter Lombard), *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1971–81).
- Photius, *On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, trans. Holy Transfiguration Monastery (New York, 1983).
- Praepositinus of Cremona, *The Summa contra haereticos ascribed to Praepositinus of Cremona*, eds. J.N. Garvin and J.A. Corbett (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1958).
- Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio ...*, eds. J.D. Mansi et al. (53 vols., Paris, 1758–1927).
- The Talmud – A Selection*, ed. N. Solomon (London, 2009).
- Thomas Aquinas, *The Power of God*, trans. R.J. Regan (New York, 2012).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, in *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita* (50 vols., Rome, 1882), iv–xii.
- University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*, trans. L. Thorndike (New York, 1975).
- William of Auvergne, *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Paris, 1674).
- William of Auvergne, *The Trinity, or the First Principles*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1995).
- William of Auvergne, *The Universe of Creatures*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998).
- William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea*, ed. J. Ribaillier (4 vols., Paris, 1980–7).

Printed secondary works

- Abate, M.T., ‘The Reorientation of Roger Bacon: Muslims, Mongols, and the Man who Knew Everything’, in A. Classen (ed.), *East Meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 523–73.
- Abulafia, D., *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (London, 1988).
- Acar, R., ‘Creation: Avicenna’s Metaphysical Account’, in D.B. Burrell, C. Cogliati, J.M. Soskice and W.R. Stoeger (eds.), *Creation and the God of Abraham* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 77–90.
- Adamson, P., ‘Freedom and Determinism’, in R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2014), i, pp. 399–413.
- Adamson, P., *On Knowledge of Particulars* (Meeting of the Aristotelian Society, 2005), https://www.academia.edu/3197513/On_Knowledge_of_Particulars (5 April 2016), pp. 274–94.
- Aertsen, J.A., *Medieval Philosophy as Transcendental Thought: From Philip the Chancellor (ca. 1225) to Francisco Suarez* (Leiden, 2012).
- D’Alverny, M.-Th., ‘Une rencontre symbolique de Jean Scot Érigène et d’Avicenne. Notes sur le Liber de causis primis et secundis et fluxu qui consequitur eas’, in J.J. O’Meara and L. Bieler (eds.), *The Mind of Eriugena* (Dublin, 1973), pp. 170–81.
- D’Alverny, M.-Th., ‘Translations and Translators’, in R.L. Benson and G. Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Toronto, 1991), pp. 421–62.
- D’Ancona, C., ‘Pseudo-“Theology of Aristotle”, Chapter 1: Structure and Composition’, *Oriens*, 36 (2001), pp. 78–112. doi:10.2307/1580477
- Angold, M., *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context* (Harlow, 2003).
- Angold, M., ‘Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile’, in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London, 1989), pp. 63–86.

- Arnold, J.H., 'The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 53–78.
- Baldwin, J.W., *Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970).
- Berger, D., 'Christian Heresy and Jewish Polemic in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 68:3/4 (1975), pp. 287–303. doi:10.1017/s0017816000017211
- Berger, D., *Judaism and Jewish Life: Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue – Essays in Jewish-Christian Relations* (Boston, 2010).
- Bertolacci, A., "Averroes ubique Avicennan persecutor": Albert the Great's Approach to the *Physics* of the *Šifā* in the Light of Averroes' Criticisms', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Physics and Cosmology* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), pp. 397–431.
- Bertolacci, A., 'A Community of Translators: The Latin Medieval Versions of Avicenna's *Book of the Cure*', in C.J. Mews and J.N. Crossley (eds.), *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe, 1100–1500* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 37–54.
- Bertolacci, A., 'On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's *Metaphysics* before Albertus Magnus: An Attempt at Periodization', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics* (Berlin and Boston, 2012), pp. 197–223.
- Bett, H., *Johannes Scotus Erigena – A Study in Mediaeval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1925).
- Bianchi, L., 'Aristotle as a Captive Bride: Notes on Gregory IX's Attitude towards Aristotelianism', in L. Honnefelder et al. (eds.), *Albertus Magnus and the Beginnings of the Medieval Reception of Aristotle in the Latin West from Richardus Rufus to Franciscus de Mayronis* (Münster, 2005), pp. 777–794.
- Biller, P., 'Goodbye to Catharism?', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 274–313.
- Biller, P., 'Northern Cathars and Higher Learning', in P. Biller and B. Dobson (eds.), *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 25–53.
- Bird, J., 'The Religious's Role in a Post-Fourth-Lateran World: Jacques de Vitry's *Sermones ad Status* and *Historia Occidentalis*', in C. Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden, 1998), pp. 207–29.
- Blankenhorn, B., *The Mystery of Union with God: Dionysian Mysticism in Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, 2015).
- Bloomfield, M.W., 'Joachim of Flora: A Critical Survey of His Canon, Teachings, Sources, Biography and Influence', *Traditio*, 13 (1957), pp. 249–311.
- Bloomfield, M.W. and Reeves, M.E., 'The Penetration of Joachism into Northern Europe', *Speculum*, 29:4 (1954), pp. 772–93. doi:10.2307/2847100
- Bougerol, J.-G., 'The Church Fathers and *Auctoritates* in Scholastic Theology to Bonaventure', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 289–335.
- Bougerol, J.-G., 'The Fathers and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: from the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 113–64.
- Braid, A.J., *Mysticism and Heresy: Studies in Radical Religion in the Central Middle Ages (c.850–1210)* (York, 2011).
- Byrd, J., 'The Necessity of Tomorrow's Sea Battle', *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 48 (2010), pp. 160–76. doi:10.1111/j.2041-6962.2010.01011.x

- Capelle, G.C., *Autour du décret de 1210: III, Amaury de Bèze: étude sur son panthéisme formel* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 16, Paris, 1932).
- Chadwick, H., *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church: From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford, 2003).
- Chenu, M.-D., 'Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale en Occident au XIII^e siècle', in *Melanges Auguste Pelzer: études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale offertes à A. Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 159–81.
- Chenu, M.-D., 'Nature and Man – the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century', in Chenu (ed.), *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (Toronto, 1997), pp. 1–48.
- Chrissis, N.G., 'The City and the Cross: The Image of Constantinople and the Latin Empire in Thirteenth-Century Papal Crusading Rhetoric', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 36:1 (2012), pp. 20–37. doi:10.1179/030701312x13238617305572
- Chrissis, N.G., *Crusading in Frankish Greece: A Study in Byzantine-Western Relations and Attitudes 1204–1282* (Turnhout, 2012).
- Classen, P., *Studium und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1983).
- Cohen, J., *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982).
- Cohen, J., 'The Jews as the Killers of Christ in the Latin Tradition, from Augustine to the Friars', *Traditio*, 39 (1983), pp. 1–27. doi:10.1017/s0362152900009557
- Colish, M.L., *Peter Lombard* (2 vols., Leiden, 1994).
- Colish, M.L., '...*Quia hodie locum non habent*: Scholastic Theologians Reflect on their Authorities', *Proceedings of the Patristic, Medieval, and Renaissance Conference*, 15 (Villanova, 1990), pp. 1–17.
- de Contenson, P.-M., 'Avicennisme latin et vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle', *Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 26 (1959), pp. 29–97.
- De Contenson, P.-M., 'La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle. Le *De retributionibus sanctorum* de Guillaume d'Auvergne et la condamnation de 1241', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 46 (1962), pp. 409–44.
- Cook, D., 'Apocalyptic Incidents during the Mongol Invasions', in W. Brandes and F. Schmieder (eds.), *Endzeiten: Eschatologie in den monotheistischen Weltreligionen* (Berlin, 2008), pp. 293–312.
- Courtenay, W.J., *Teaching Careers at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1988).
- Crossnoe, M., 'Education and the Care of Souls: Pope Gregory IX, the Order of St. Victor, and the University of Paris in 1237', *Mediaeval Studies*, 61 (1999), pp. 137–72. doi:10.1484/j.ms.2.306461
- Dales, R.C., 'Robert Grosseteste's Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World', *Speculum*, 61:3 (1986), pp. 544–63. doi:10.2307/2851595
- Dales, R.C., 'Robert Grosseteste's Treatise *De finitate motus et temporis*', *Traditio*, 19 (1963), pp. 245–66. doi:10.1017/s0362152900010400
- Daniel, E.R., 'The Double Procession of the Holy Spirit in Joachim of Fiore's Understanding of History', *Speculum*, 55:3 (1980), pp. 469–83. doi:10.2307/2847236
- D'Avray, D.L., 'The Cathars from Non-Catholic Sources', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 177–84.
- D'Avray, D.L., *The Preaching of the Friars – Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985).
- Davy, M.M., *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230–1231: contribution à l'histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1931).

- Diehl, P.D., 'Overcoming Reluctance to Prosecute Heresy', in S.L. Waugh and P.D. Diehl (eds.), *Christendom and its Discontents: Persecution and Rebellion, 1000–1500* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 47–66.
- Dod, B.G., 'Aristoteles Latinus', in N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny and J. Pinborg (eds.), *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 43–79.
- Dondaine, H.-F., 'L'objet et le medium de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIII^e siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 19 (1952), pp. 60–130.
- Duggan, A., 'Conciliar Law, 1123–1215 – The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils', in W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (eds.), *History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1244: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (Washington, 2008), pp. 318–66.
- Edwards, M., 'Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 80–91.
- Elders, L.J., 'Thomas Aquinas and the Fathers of the Church', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 337–66.
- Elliott, D., *Fallen Bodies, Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1999).
- Emery, G., *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2010).
- Evans, G.R., *Anselm* (London, 1989).
- Evans, G.R., 'Masters and Disciples: Aspects of Christian Interpretation of the Old Testament in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in M. Sæbe (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament 1/2: The History of Its Interpretation From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300): Part 2: The Middle Ages* (3 vols., Göttingen, 1996–2012), i, pp. 237–60.
- Ferruolo, S.C., *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics* (Stanford, California, 1985).
- Feuchter, J., 'The *heretici* of the Languedoc: Local Holy Men and Women or Organized Religious Group? New Evidence from Inquisitional, Notarial and Historiographical Sources', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 112–30.
- Fidora, A., 'Albert the Great and the Latin Talmud', in A. Fidora and N. Polloni (eds.), *Appropriation, Interpretation and Criticism: Philosophical and Theological Exchanges between the Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Intellectual Tradition* (Barcelona, 2017), pp. 121–36.
- Fidora, A., Fontaine, R., Freudenthal, G., Harvey, J.H. and Schwartz, Y., 'Studies: Introducing a Neglected Chapter in European Cultural History', in Fontaine and Freudenthal (eds.), *Latin-into-Hebrew, Texts and Studies* (2 vols., Leiden, 2013), i, pp. 9–18.
- Friedman, J., Hoff, J.C. and Chazan, R., *The Trial of the Talmud* (Toronto, 2012).
- Friedman, R.L., 'Medieval Trinitarian Theology from the Late Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 197–209.
- Funkenstein, A., 'Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages', *Viator*, 2 (1972), pp. 373–82.
- García y García, A., 'The Fourth Lateran Council and the Canonists', in W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (eds.), *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1244: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (Washington, 2008), pp. 367–78.
- Geanakoplos, D.J., *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962).

- Geréby, G., 'Hidden Themes in Fourteenth-Century Byzantine and Latin Theological Debates: Monarchianism and Crypto-Dyophysitism', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel (eds.), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 183–211.
- Gieseler, J.C.L., *A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1853).
- Gill, J., *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400* (New Brunswick, 1979).
- Glorieux, P., 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–52, 225–67.
- Goodman, L.E., *Avicenna* (Ithaca, updated edition, 2005).
- Goulet, R., Flamand, J.-M. and Aouad, M., *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* (Supplément, Paris, 2003).
- Grayzel, S., *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (New York, 1966).
- Gregory, T., 'The Platonic Inheritance', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 54–80.
- Gutas, D., 'Origins in Baghdad', in R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2014), i, pp. 11–25.
- Hamilton, B., 'Cathar Links with the Balkans and Byzantium', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 131–50.
- Hamilton, B., 'The Cistercians in the Crusade States', in Hamilton (ed.), *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades: 900–1300* (London, 1979), pp. 405–22.
- Hamilton, B., 'Wisdom from the East: The Reception by the Cathars of Eastern Dualist Texts', in P. Biller and A. Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 38–60.
- Häring, N.M., 'A Treatise on the Trinity by Gilbert of Poitiers', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 39 (1972), pp. 14–50.
- Häring, N.M., 'The Porretans and the Greek Fathers', *Mediaeval Studies*, 24 (1962), pp. 181–209. doi:10.1484/j.ms.2.306786
- Haskins, C.H., 'The Greek Element in the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century', in Haskins (ed.), *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), pp. 141–54.
- Haskins, C.H., 'North-Italian Translators of the Twelfth Century: Italy and Byzantium in the Twelfth Century', in Haskins (ed.), *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), pp. 194–222.
- Haskins, C.H., 'Versions of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*', in Haskins (ed.), *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), pp. 223–41.
- Hasse, D.N., *Avicenna's De Anima in the Latin West: The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul 1160–1300* (London, 2000).
- Hasse, D.N., 'Avicenna's "Giver of Forms" in Latin Philosophy, especially in the Works of Albertus Magnus', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 225–49.
- Hasselhoff, G.K., *Dicit Rabbi Moyses. Studien zum Bild von Moses Maimonides im Lateinischen Westen vom 13. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg, 2004).
- Hasselhoff, G.K., 'Maimonides in the Latin Middle Ages: An Introductory Survey', *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 9 (2002), pp. 1–20. doi:10.1628/0944570022720963
- Hasselhoff, G.K., 'The Persian Talmud Trials and the Translation of Rashi's Bible Commentaries', *Henoch*, 37:1 (2015), pp. 29–42.
- Hasselhoff, G.K., 'The Reception of Maimonides in the Latin World: The Evidence of the Latin Translations in the 13th–15th Century', *Materia giudaica: Rivista dell'associazione italiana per lo studio del giudaismo*, 1/2 (2001), pp. 258–80.

- Hauréau, B., *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique* (2 vols., Paris, 1872), i.
- Hildebrand, S.M., 'The Trinity in the Ante-Nicene Fathers', in G Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 95–108.
- Hussey, J.M., *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1986).
- Ivry, A.L., 'The Guide and Maimonides' Philosophical Sources', in K. Seeskin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 58–81.
- Ivry, A.L., *Maimonides' 'Guide of the Perplexed': A Philosophical Guide* (Chicago, 2016).
- Jackson, P., *The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410* (Harlow, 2005).
- Jordan, M.D., 'Theological Exegesis and Aquinas Treaty "Against the Greeks"', *Church History*, 56:4 (1987), pp. 445–56. doi:10.2307/3166427
- Kaczynski, B.M., 'The Authority of the Fathers: Patristic Texts in Early Medieval Libraries and Scriptoria', *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 16 (2006), pp. 1–27. doi:10.1484/j.jml.2.303227
- Kenny, A., *Ancient Philosophy* (Oxford, 2004).
- Kienzle, B.M., *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145–1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (York, 2001).
- Klein-Braslavy, S., 'Bible Commentary', in K. Seeskin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides* (Cambridge, 2005), pp 245–72.
- Klein-Braslavy, S., *Maimonides as a Biblical Interpreter* (Boston, 2011).
- Klepper, D.C., *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Reading of Jewish Text in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2007).
- Kluxen, W., 'Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism', in S Pines and Y. Yovel (eds.), *Maimonides and Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 1986), pp. 224–32.
- Kolbaba, T., *The Byzantine Lists* (Urbana, Illinois, 2000).
- Lacey, T.A., 'Gregory IX and Greek Ordinations', *The Church Historical Society*, 33 (1898), pp. 3–16.
- Lasker, D.J., 'Latin into Hebrew and the Medieval Jewish-Christian Debate', in R. Fontaine and G. Freudenthal (eds.), *Latin-into-Hebrew, Texts and Studies* (2 vols., Leiden, 2013), i, pp. 333–47.
- Lester, A.E., 'Review of B.M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania 1145–1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard*', *Catholic Historical Review*, 90:4 (2004), pp. 758–9. doi:10.1353/cat.2005.0046
- Lewis, N., 'Robert Grosseteste and the Church Fathers', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 197–229.
- Lewis, N., 'William of Auvergne's Account of the Enuntiable: Its Relations to Nominalism and the Doctrine of the Eternal Truths', *Vivarium*, 33:2 (1995), pp. 113–36.
- Lewry, P.O., 'Papal Ideals and the University of Paris 1170–1303', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150–1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 363–88.
- Lim, K., 'God's Knowledge of Particulars: Avicenna, Maimonides, and Gersonides', *Journal of Islamic Philosophy*, 5 (2009), pp. 75–98. doi:10.5840/islamicphil200954
- Lindberg, D.C., *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler* (Chicago, 1976).
- Lindberg, D.C., 'The Transmission of Greek and Arabic Learning to the West', in Lindberg (ed.), *Science in the Middle Ages* (Chicago, 1978), pp. 52–90.
- Linde, C., 'An Introduction to Sources and Perspective', in Linde (ed.), *Making and Breaking the Rules: Discussion, Implementation, and Consequences of Dominican Legislation* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 1–15.
- Lipton, S., *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible Moralisee* (Berkeley, 1999).
- Lock, P., *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades* (London, 2006).

- Loeb, I., *La controverse sur le Talmud sous saint Louis* (Paris, 1881).
- López-Farjeat, L.X., *Aquinas on the Eternity of the World in II Sent., d.1, q. 1 art. 5 and his Arabic/Islamic and Jewish Sources*, presented at the *Aquinas and the Arabs* research seminar (Houston, 2010), http://academic.mu.edu/taylorr/Aquinas_and_the_Arabs_Project_Essays/2._Lopez-Farjeat,_Aquinas_on_the_Eternity_of_the_World.html (16 May 2016), pp. 1–24.
- Lossky, V., *The Vision of God*, trans. A. Moorhouse (Aylesbury, 1973).
- Marenbon, J., *Boethius* (Oxford, 2003).
- Marenbon, J., 'Boethius: From Antiquity to the Middle Ages', in Marenbon (ed.), *Medieval Philosophy* (London, 1998), pp. 11–28.
- Marenbon, J., *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre. Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1981).
- Marenbon, J., 'Gilbert of Poitiers. A Note on the Porretani', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 328–57.
- Marmura, M.E., 'Some Aspects of Avicenna's Theory of God's Knowledge of Particulars', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 82 (1962), pp. 299–312. doi:10.2307/597641
- Marshall, B.D., 'The Deep Things of God: Trinitarian Pneumatology', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 400–13.
- Matter, E.A., 'The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 83–111.
- Matthews, G.B., 'Augustinianism', in R. Pasnau (ed.), *Cambridge Medieval Philosophy* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2014), i, pp. 86–98.
- McGinnis, J., *Avicenna* (Oxford, 2010).
- McKitterick, R. and Marenbon, J., 'Philosophy and its Background in the Early Medieval West', in J. Marenbon (ed.), *Medieval Philosophy* (London, 1998), pp. 96–119.
- Mews, C.J., 'The Lists of Heresies Imputed to Peter Abelard', *Revue Bénédictine*, 95 (1985), pp. 73–110. doi:10.1484/j.rb.4.01113
- Miethke, J., 'Die Kirche und die Universitäten im 13 Jahrhundert', in J. Fried (ed.), *Schulen und Studium im Sozialen Wandel des Hohen und Späten Mittelalters* (Sigmaringen, 1986), pp. 285–320.
- Miethke, J., 'Practical Intentions of Scholasticism: The Example of Political Theory', in W.J. Courtenay and J. Miethke (eds.), *Universities and Schooling in Medieval Society* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 211–28.
- Minnis, A.J., and Scott, A.B., *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100–1375: The Commentary-tradition* (Oxford, 1998).
- Moore, R.I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950–1250* (Oxford, 1987).
- Moore, R.I., 'Principles at Stake: The Debate of April 2013 in Retrospect', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 257–73.
- Moran, D., *The Philosophy of John Scotus Eriugena: A Study of Idealism in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Mulchahey, M.M., '*First the Bow is Bent in Study*' – Dominican Education before 1350 (Toronto, 1998).
- Neocleous, S., 'Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies against the Crusades: History and Myth', *Journal of Medieval History*, 36 (2010), pp. 253–74. doi:10.1016/j.jmedhist.2010.06.001
- Nielsen, L.O., *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130–1180* (Leiden, 1982).

- Olszowy-Schlanger, J., 'The Study of the Aramaic Targum by Christians in Medieval France and England', in A. Houtman, E. van Staaldoune-Sulman and H.-M. Kirn (eds.), *A Jewish Targum in a Christian World* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 231–49.
- O'Meara, J.J., *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1988).
- Paolini, L., 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in P. Biller and A. Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 83–103.
- Pasnau, R., 'The Latin Aristotle', in C. Shields (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 665–89.
- Pasquale, P., 'The University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century – Proclus and the *Liber de causis*', in S. Gersh (ed.), *Interpreting Proclus: From Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 264–98.
- Pegg, M.G., *A Most Holy War – The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008).
- Pegg, M.G., 'The Paradigm of Catharism; or, the Historians' Illusion', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 21–52.
- Pickavé, M., 'On the Latin Reception of Avicenna's Theory of Individuation', in D.N. Hasse and A. Bertolacci (eds.), *The Arabic, Hebrew and Latin Reception of Avicenna's Metaphysics* (Berlin, 2012), pp. 339–63.
- Power, A., *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Pranger, B., 'Sic et Non: Patristic Authority between Refusal and Acceptance: Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2. vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 165–93.
- Principe, W.H., 'The School Theologians' Views of the Papacy', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150–1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 45–116.
- Rembaum, E., 'The Talmud and the Popes: Reflections on the Talmud Trials of the 1240s', *Viator*, 13 (1982), pp. 203–24.
- Rist, R., '"Lupi rapaces in ovium vestimentis": Heretics and Heresy in Papal Correspondence', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 229–41.
- Roach, A.P., *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society, 1100–1300* (Harlow, 2005).
- Robb, F., 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 48:1 (1997), pp. 22–43.
- Robinson, J.A., *Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster: A Study of the Abbey under Norman Rule* (Cambridge, 1911).
- Rose, P.L., 'When was the Talmud Burnt in Paris? A Critical Examination of the Christian and Jewish Sources and a New Dating: June 1241', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 62:2 (2011), pp. 324–39. doi:10.18647/3046/jjs-2011
- Rosenthal, J.M., 'The Talmud on Trial: The Disputation at Paris in the Year 1240', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 47 (1956–7), pp. 58–76, 145–69.
- Sackville, L.J., *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011).
- Sackville, L.J., 'The Textbook Heretic: Moneta of Cremona's Cathars', in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 208–28.
- Salman, D., 'Note sur la première influence d'Averroès', *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, 40 (1937), pp. 203–12. doi:10.3406/phlou.1937.3030
- Schmieder, F., 'Christians, Jews, Muslims – and Mongols: Fitting a Foreign People into the Western Christian Apocalyptic Scenario', *Medieval Encounters*, 12:2 (2006), pp. 274–95. doi:10.1163/157006706778884880
- Schumacher, L., *Divine Illumination: The History and Future of Augustine's Theory of Knowledge* (Oxford, 2011).

- Schwartz, Y., 'Authority, Control, and Conflict in Thirteenth-Century Paris: Contextualizing the Talmud Trial', in E. Baumgarten and J.D. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France* (New York, 2015), pp. 93–110.
- Şenocak, N., 'The Franciscan *Studium Generale*: A New Interpretation', in K. Emery, W. Courtenay and S.M. Metzger (eds.), *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at the Papal Court* (Turnhout, 2012), pp. 231–36.
- Sennis, A., 'Questions about the Cathars', in Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016), pp. 1–20.
- Siecienski, A.E., *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010).
- Silano, G., 'Of Sleep and Sleeplessness: The Papacy and the Law, 1150–1300', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150–1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 343–61.
- Simelidis, C., *Selected Poems of Gregory of Nazianzus I.2.17; II.1.10, 19, 32: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary* (Göttingen, 2009).
- Smalley, B., 'Gregory IX and the Two Faces of the Soul', in Smalley (ed.), *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning from Abelard to Wyclif* (London, 1981), pp. 117–20.
- Smalley, B., 'William of Auvergne, John of La Rochelle and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Old Law', in Smalley (ed.), *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning from Abelard to Wyclif* (London, 1981), pp. 121–81.
- Smith, D.J., *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon, c. 1167–1276* (Leiden, 2010).
- Smith, J.W., 'The Trinity in the Fourth-Century Fathers', in G. Emery and M. Levering (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 109–22.
- Smith, L., 'William of Auvergne and the Law of the Jews and the Muslims', in T.J. Heffernan and T.E. Burman (eds.), *Scripture and Pluralism: Reading the Bible in the Religiously Plural Worlds of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Leiden, 2005), pp. 123–42.
- Speer, A., 'Lichtkausalität. Zum Verhältnis von dionysischer Lichttheologie und Metaphysik bei Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin', in T̄socho Boiadzhiev, G. Kapriev and A. Speer, *Die Dionysius-Rezeption im Mittelalter: Internationales Kolloquium in Sofia vom 8. bis 11. April 1999 unter der Schirmherrschaft der Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 343–72.
- Spence, R., 'Gregory IX's Attempted Expeditions to the Latin Empire of Constantinople: The Crusade for the Union of the Latin and Greek Churches', *Journal of Medieval History*, 5 (1979), pp. 163–76. doi:10.1016/0304-4181(79)90034-4
- Stroumsa, S., '"True Felicity": Paradise in the Thought of Avicenna and Maimonides', *Medieval Encounters*, 4:1 (1998), pp. 51–77. doi:10.1163/157006798x00034
- Sweeney, L., 'Doctrine of Creation in *Liber de Causis*', in C.J. O'Neil (ed.), *An Etienne Gilson Tribute* (Milwaukee, 1959), pp. 274–89.
- Synan, E.A., 'The Pope's Other Sheep', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities 1150–1300* (Toronto, 1989), pp. 389–411.
- Taylor, R.C., *Averroes*, <http://bartholomew.stanford.edu/authors/averroestext.html> (2 April 2016).
- Teicher, J.L., 'Christian Theology and the Jewish Opposition to Maimonides', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 43 (1942), pp. 68–76. doi:10.1093/jts/os-xliii.169-170.68-b
- Teske, R.J., 'William of Auvergne on the Individuation of Human Souls', *Traditio*, 49 (1994), pp. 77–93. doi:10.1017/s0362152900013003
- Théry, G., *Autour du décret de 1210: I, David de Dinant: etude sur son panthéisme matérialiste* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 6, Paris, 1925).

- Tsougarakis, N.I., *The Latin Religious Orders in Medieval Greece* (Turnhout, 2012).
- Tugwell, S., *Albert and Thomas* (New York, 1988).
- De Vaux, R., *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme Latin aux confins des XIIe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1934).
- Verger, J., 'Patterns', in H. de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe: Universities in the Middle Ages* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1992), i, pp. 35–74.
- Wei, I.P., *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris* (Cambridge, 2012).
- Wei, J.C., *Gratian the Theologian* (Washington, 2016).
- Werckmeister, J., 'The Reception of the Church Fathers in Canon Law', in I. Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West from the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden, 1997), i, pp. 51–83.
- Whalen, B.E., *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009).
- Wolff, R.L., 'The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans', *Traditio*, 2 (1944), pp. 213–37. doi:10.1017/s0362152900017189
- Young, S.E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215–1248* (Cambridge, 2014).

Unpublished Theses

- Charansonnet, A., 'L'université, l'Eglise et l'Etat dans les sermons du cardinal Eudes de Châteauroux (1190?–1273)' (Lyon University, PhD thesis, 2001).
- De Courrèges d'Agnos, C., 'Sainte Dominique et les Dominicains dans les sermons du Cardinal Eudes de Châteauroux (1190?–1273)' (Lyon University, M.St. thesis, 2014).
- Eisenberg, S.R., 'Reading Medieval Religious Disputation: The 1240 "Debate" between Rabbi Yehiel of Paris and Friar Nicholas Donin' (University of Michigan, PhD thesis, 2008).
- McGinnis, J., 'Time and Time Again: A Study of Aristotle and Ibn SINA's Temporal Theories' (Pennsylvania University, PhD thesis, 2000).
- Moczar, D.J., 'From Hugolino Conti to Gregory IX: The Making of a Medieval Pope' (George Mason University, PhD thesis, 1990).
- Noone, T.B., 'An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum Super Metaphysicam* Book XII, d. 2: A Work Attributed to Richard Rufus of Cornwall' (University of Toronto, PhD thesis, 1987).
- Reno, E.A., 'The Authoritative Text: Raymond of Penyafort's Editing of the *Decretals of Gregory IX* (1234)' (Columbia University, PhD thesis, 2011).
- Young, S.E., 'Queen of the Faculties: Theology and Theologians at the University of Paris, c.1215–c.1250' (University of Wisconsin-Madison, PhD thesis, 2009).

Website

- 'The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church', <https://webdept.fiu.edu/~mirandas/consistorie-s-xiii.htm> (7 May 2016).

4 Evaluation of influences

This chapter assesses the probable and possible influences behind the individual articles and the condemnation as a whole. The first part links the issues identified for each article in Chapter 2 with the aberrant theories discussed in Chapter 3 by examining the sources used by theologians prior to the condemnation, visible or implicit in their writings. This analysis includes developments over time, to identify any changes which might have increased concern. For example, whether the world could have been created from nothing (article eight) had been an issue since Augustine or indeed earlier, but new Aristotelian texts and Arab commentaries appear to have concentrated the scholars' attention. This chapter accordingly compares three 'control' texts – Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* from the 1150s, and the commentaries on them by Alexander of Hales in the 1220s and Albertus Magnus in the 1240s – complemented by their other writings and works by other theologians. A summary of contemporary texts containing, or possibly containing, the propositions now being condemned is at Appendix B.

The second part considers the choice of articles as a whole and the condemnation's purpose and timing. Specific concerns may explain individual articles, but not why others were omitted. Thus, if the main concerns revolved around the infiltration of heretical or Jewish views into Catholic doctrine, an obvious omission is Christology. There are around twenty-one questions out of the 572 in Douai, MS 434, specifically on Christ, including his conception, two natures and glorified body, with many more linked to him, such as on his knowledge (considered independently from God's).¹ Institutional developments and external events remain firmly in the frame, as does the continuing importance of Lateran IV's statement of faith, reiterated in Gregory IX's decretals.

Seen in the context of the discussion in Chapter 3 of the development of ideas in the areas covered by the articles, analysis of contemporary relevant texts demonstrates that they represent the crystallisation of issues that had long been debated in the schools and at the university. They were not exclusively the product of the new learning or of contemporary concerns. But neither can the role of new learning and concerns be discounted as escalating or redefining many of the issues. The condemnation sought to provide clarity and certainty on issues arising from a combination of all these strands of thought at a critical stage of the theology faculty's maturation.

Doctrinal influences on individual articles

Article one: beatific vision

Douai, MS 434, offers an idea of the scale of discussion on the vision of God in the 1230s. Out of its 572 entries, covering a huge range of theological issues, the manuscript contains around twenty-three questions bearing on the beatific vision, a small but significant proportion, and their wide-ranging contents demonstrate the open and fluid nature of the debate before the condemnation.²

Chapter 2 noted the problem posed by biblical texts – and patristic interpretations – which appeared to contradict themselves over whether God’s face (or essence) could ever be seen. Augustine’s own position changed over time, and the Latin and Greek traditions developed in different directions.³ Related philosophical issues included the difficulty of a created being seeing an uncreated one, or a finite body seeing an infinite one. For those believing in the resurrection of the body, a second-order issue was the role of the body, since if this was linked to worldly concerns, its reunion with the soul after Judgment Day, albeit now purified, should make seeing God more difficult.

It is tempting to view the combination of biblical interpretation, overlaid with Latin and Greek patristic interpretation, in turn coloured by Neoplatonic beliefs, as wholly responsible for article one. Expounding scriptural texts was certainly a major preoccupation for Peter Lombard and thirteenth-century theologians, while interest in Greek theology and Neoplatonism appears to have increased between the 1150s and the 1240s, with Latin translations of works such as the *Liber de causis*. Peter Lombard relied extensively on the Bible and on Augustine, together with other mainly Latin authorities such as Jerome, Isidore and Gregory the Great. Alexander of Hales cited both Latin and (more heavily than Peter Lombard) Greek Fathers in his *Glossa*. The list included Augustine, Anselm, John Damascene, Isidore, pseudo-Dionysius and Aristotle (often the *Liber de causis*). In his commentary on the *Sententiae*, just after the condemnation, Albertus Magnus explicitly referred to Greek theology, apparently trying to make it conform to the truth of article one. Albertus argued John Chrysostom’s concerns about the unknowability of God could be resolved through his own words: Chrysostom said that we all know God; but only the one begotten from him knows also what he is (‘quid est’); so Chrysostom did not deny God’s substance was seen, but only stated that it was not seen as perfectly by created intellects as by itself.⁴ Theologians whose views partly reflected the Greek and Neoplatonic tradition included Guerric of St.-Quentin and Hugh of St.-Cher.⁵

A related concern – whether created, finite creatures could see the infinite, uncreated God – added a further dimension to the interpretation of the biblical texts. For the Bible and, indeed, for Plato, something infinite could be viewed as lacking an end and hence as imperfect, rather than being beyond any limitation. Peter Lombard referred to God’s infinite nature but this may have implied God’s limitless power, eternal nature and similar attributes such as goodness, rather than that his essence itself was beyond limitation. Although apparently not picked up until the end of the twelfth century, Neoplatonism changed this, interpreting

infinity as above being and without limit or form – this is the concept found, for example, in the *Liber de causis* and in some thirteenth-century Latin debate.⁶

The question of God's infinity figured in Douai, MS 434, Questions 454 and 480. Question 454 argued for some proportionality between human and angelic intellects in respect of God, while, conversely, Question 480 denied any such proportionality, arguing that neither humans nor angels could comprehend God.⁷ The Dominican Richard Fishacre struggled with the question in his commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* in the early 1240s; and the Franciscan Odo Rigaud, writing after the 1241/4 condemnation, noted the problem of reconciling the infinite and finite, offering his own solution, that if the finite could not act on the infinite, it could at least receive from it, and it could receive it whole.⁸ Alexander of Hales' views fluctuated: in his *Glossa* he argued that finite minds always start with finite things, while in a quodlibet attributed to him he asserted a kind of quasi-infinity for humans so that, raised up, they could see the infinite deity.⁹ After much discussion, however, the *Summa Fratris Alexandri* (started by Alexander but with other contributors) concluded God's essence was infinite; and, although it could be argued that such an attribute attached to his power, not his essence, since these could not be divided, it must be attached to both.¹⁰ Albertus Magnus, perhaps wrestling with the condemnation's imposition of the view that the divine essence must be visible, believed that, in some respects, God was infinite and always beyond understanding. However, he tended also to see God's infinity only in terms of his external effects. He was clear that the concept must not be viewed in its privative sense. John Chrysostom and John Damascene both figured in his discussion, supporting the likely derivation of the issue from the influence of the Greek Fathers and their Neoplatonic heritage, complemented by later works.¹¹

The views held by Paris theologians reflecting the position subsequently condemned all showed evidence of similar issues relating to biblical interpretation and God's infinite and unknowable nature. However, other influences on the article's inclusion cannot be discounted. William of Auvergne connected two theories he attributed to Plato, or to Aristotle and his followers, with the vision of God – both, in fact, derived from the new Aristotelian texts and from Avicenna, as William interpreted him. These were: that separated souls lose their individuality; and that neither the intelligence, nor separated souls, could grasp particulars and thus could not grasp God. The first theory's connection was indirect: William believed it meant that only one soul would be able to praise God in heaven (and thus, presumably, see his essence there).¹²

The second theory's connection was direct. William devoted an entire chapter of his *De anima* to show that souls in heaven knew particulars, i.e. God. In an important passage clearly addressing the new Aristotelian learning, he argued:

[T]he intellective power ... is not ignorant of particulars if it is intent on knowing them. Otherwise, since the blessed creator is singular and individual in the highest degree of singularity and individuality, the human intellective power would be prevented by a natural impossibility from the intellectual understanding and cognition of him ... [O]n this view the human soul would

be prevented by a natural impossibility from a true and proper knowledge of the creator ... Whatever, then, the human soul may know or understand about universals or common features, it is ... not on this account truly and properly able to know the creator ...

William continued, using texts common in other discussions on the beatific vision:

[T]he law and doctrine of the Christians has this as its most noble and chief promise, namely, concerning the vision of the creator, for the lawgiver himself ... says, 'Blessed are the clean of heart because they shall see God' (Mt. v:8), and again he says, 'This is eternal life: to know you, the true God ...' There are ... other promises ... Such are the following: ... 'When he shall appear, we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is' (1.Jn. iii:2), and elsewhere, 'We see now through a glass in an enigma, but then we shall see face to face' (1.Cor. xiii:12). Moreover, what is the glory of the saints and blessed spirits but the continuous, most lucid, and most enjoyable sight of the beauty of the creator? For the very lawgiver of the Christians explicitly says, speaking and talking about the little ones, 'Their angels always see the face of my father who is in heaven' (Mt. xviii:10).¹³

William's use of such biblical quotations in his discussion of Aristotle's and Avicenna's views demonstrates beyond doubt that he saw these as part of the same issue on the beatific vision. William's association with the condemnation's imposition, coupled with the dating of his *De anima* to around 1240, means this must have formed at least a contributory strand to the article's inclusion. Moreover, similar points were made by Albertus Magnus in his commentary on the *Sententiae*.¹⁴

Finally, again based on Aristotle's views, especially as refined by Avicenna, the physical theory of vision was an issue, with the idea of sight through a medium, such as a mirror, troubling numerous theologians. Perhaps most notable was, again, William of Auvergne, who used the theory in his *De retributionibus*, but others, for example Albertus Magnus, discussed the mechanics of vision – what an 'image' consisted of, the difference between seeing someone in a mirror or copy and face-to-face and, more generally, the difference between vision through the senses and the intellect.¹⁵

Thus, compounding the intrinsic problems over apparently contradictory biblical texts, there seem to have been three periods when works would have reached Paris theologians which could have influenced the article's inclusion, and three inter-linked sources. First were the divergent Latin and Greek traditions, dating back to the Church Fathers and manifested in works not merely by, for example, Augustine, but also by pseudo-Dionysius, his translator Eriugena, and others, widely read throughout the twelfth century and known earlier. This was augmented in the early thirteenth (and possibly late twelfth) century by specific concerns over whether finite beings could see an infinite God, with the likely source being works such as the *Liber de causis*. Finally, there were concerns over the

limitation of knowledge to particulars, visible much more clearly once Aristotle's works, for example the *Posterior Analytics*, were properly available, and through Avicenna. All these influences are visible in Latin texts in the 1220s and 1230s – all appear to have contributed to article one's inclusion.

Articles two and three: the Trinity

While the vision of God was an issue for any theology based on some higher entity, however designated, the Trinity and relationships within it were specific to Christianity, although wider philosophical principles and logical techniques also applied. Although the offending proposition in article two could be said to stem indirectly from Aristotle's *Categories*, this was because the conundrum of three different persons as a single essence needed solving – a question for which, with Boethius as intermediary, Aristotle provided the tools. The challenge was to square logical argument with theology.

Much of the debate relevant to article two centred on different views of the notions and relations, skirting around the territory but not directly referring to it. William of Auvergne's *De Trinitate*, probably from the early 1220s, contained perhaps the most important discussion for identifying the various strands and, while without explicit attributions, these can still be reasonably inferred.¹⁶ William set out four contemporary views, straightaway dismissing the first – 'these comparisons or differences or notions are more than the persons of which they are the comparisons ... that is, whether they have their own being (*esse*) that is joined or added to the person'.¹⁷ However, William took the remaining three views seriously and tried to reconcile them. Accordingly, he dealt with a second theory, probably held by Praepositinus of Cremona, which he reported as stating: 'when one says that paternity is in the Father or that the Father is distinguished from the Son by paternity, these are ways of speaking ...'. William viewed this as true but facile, since 'no one ever said that his paternity is really something other than the Father'. Similarly, he interpreted a third view, that the notions are not 'esse', but are related ('adesse') to the three persons, as correct but superficial. He stated: '[T]hose 'who say the notions are relative ('adesse') assert ... this correctly and truly. Relatives are, of course, for each other, but they are not in each other'. William probably believed this was Gilbert of Poitiers' view, and his comment shows that, although condemned in 1148, a version of this theory was still current and not inadmissible, albeit reduced or even 'sanitised'. Finally, on the fourth theory, probably reflecting the ruling at the Rheims consistory of 1148, William noted some people believed that notions 'can in God truly name only the person or the essence because there seems to be absolutely nothing else there in any way whatsoever'. But William saw difficulties even in this view. He clearly did not accept the Rheims ruling had fully resolved the underlying difficulties in differentiating the persons of the Trinity.¹⁸

What remains so notable for article two is the apparent lack of any substantial new influences to transform it or increase its urgency. Although new arguments had appeared – for example, William of Auvergne followed Avicenna's thinking

on relation quite closely – they did not fundamentally affect the underlying position.¹⁹ Discussions seem to progress logically over the centuries, albeit becoming more complex as the differences between the relationships between the Father and Son, on the one hand, and the Holy Spirit, on the other, were explored with increasing intensity, and with some new concepts applied. Augustine saw the apparent difference in the Holy Spirit's relationship with the Father and Son from that of the Father with the Son as primarily semantic:

Nor should the reader be worried by our saying that the Holy Spirit ... is said relationship-wise, on the grounds that there does not seem to be a corresponding name to which this one is referred ... But this happens in many relationships, where we cannot find two corresponding words to be referred to each other.²⁰

Peter Lombard wrote: 'Some believe that the Holy Spirit is not so called relative to the Father and Son, because the terms do not correspond reciprocally; but this is false'. He cited Augustine's interpretation, explaining that 'although we say "the Gift of the Father ...", we cannot say "Father of the Gift" ...; but in order that these may reciprocally correspond, we say "Gift of the giver" and "giver of the Gift" ...'.²¹ Alexander of Hales' approach was more complex, exposing clear differences between the Holy Spirit as against the Father and Son:

I say therefore that the Son proceeds from the Father according to the whole substance of the father and according to his whole principle ('ratio') [i.e. as both innascible and Father]; the Holy Spirit proceeds ... from the whole substance of the Father, but not according to the whole principle [i.e. as innascible only].

Moreover, 'the Holy Spirit, even if he is undifferentiated from the Father, he is not ... the "species" [of the Father]' – hence, unlike the Son, he is not the Father's 'imago'.²² Albertus Magnus, in turn, introduced the concepts of actuality and potentiality from the new Aristotelian learning to explain how the Father and Son remained distinct persons but one in substance, albeit in the context of the Holy Spirit's procession.²³

Although new arguments therefore clearly surfaced, they do not appear to have changed the nature of the debate significantly. Moreover, the influence of Gilbert of Poitiers was clearly visible throughout. In his *Sententiae*, Peter Lombard refuted, without attribution, the views of 'some adversaries of the truth' who 'grant that Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or the three persons, are one God and one substance', but 'refuse to grant that the one God or one substance is three persons. They say that the divine substance is predicated of the three persons, not the three persons of the divine substance'. Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* noted that their reason, as exemplified by Boethius, was that 'the divine essence is subject to no one', explaining that the place of the essence was in the predicate while that of the substance was in the subject. While, like Peter Lombard, Alexander did

not attribute the theory, in commenting on the same passage Albertus Magnus referred explicitly to the 'Porretani, namely Gilbert and his followers', again offering an analysis of the use of subject and predicate.²⁴ Moreover, it is clear that the same questions, dating back at least to the fourth century, which troubled Gilbert were still on the agenda. Replying to a question whether his personal characteristic added anything to God over and above his hypostasis, Gueric of St.-Quentin referred to Sabellius, noting that, if it added nothing, in divine matters there would be no distinction according to reality ('rem') but only according to name, as Sabellius posited.²⁵

The above extracts, while not directly relating to article two of the condemnation, demonstrate that related issues, the views of Gilbert of Poitiers and indeed the earlier fourth-century controversies were topical in Paris in the period preceding and surrounding the condemnation. But there were no obvious new threats to explain article two's inclusion in the condemnation in its own right. The reason seems likely, therefore, to be primarily its link with article three, with Gilbert's theory, however mangled in transmission, seen as entailing the single procession of the Holy Spirit, although he himself opposed this view.²⁶

In contrast, the dispute with the Greek Church over the dual procession of the Holy Spirit gave article three immediate, pressing relevance and, as thinking developed from Peter Lombard to Albertus Magnus, the Greek elements became more pronounced and integrated into the discussions. In other respects, however, the position was similar to article two. It was clearly a 'home-grown' issue, irrespective of Greek views, arising from problems inherent in the Trinitarian structure, and was often discussed separately from the Greek position – or, if the context was Greek doctrine, the main concern was frequently with John Damascene, and other much revered Greek Fathers, rather than the contemporary dispute.

Peter Lombard set the agenda. Following analysis of the relation of generation and procession to essence and substance, he turned to Augustine's argument on the Holy Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son, then moving to the Greek position on the procession, where he focused mainly on arguments over conciliar decisions about the Creed. However, Peter Lombard asserted that, in fact, the Greeks agreed with the Latins on meaning, if not on words, since they confessed the Holy Spirit to be 'of the Son', in the same way that he was of the Father, which equated to saying 'from' each of them. He also argued that Greek patristic authorities supported the dual procession. However, his subsequent discussion on other issues on the procession and status of the Holy Spirit did not refer to the Greeks, although covering topics – such as the equality between the persons – which formed part of that debate.²⁷

Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* followed a similar pattern, first discussing the Spirit's role as love and then turning to the debate with the Greek Church. However, in contrast to Peter Lombard, his account of the Greek arguments relied heavily on Anselm of Canterbury's *De processione Spiritus Sancti*. Alexander also cited John Damascene, although stating he should not be followed on this topic since he described the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father and resting in the Son ('in Filio requiescens').²⁸ Alexander's subsequent

analysis included many arguments relevant to the Greek position but without explicit reference to it.

Comparison of Alexander's discussion in his *Glossa*, dating before 1227, with that in his pre-Franciscan *quaestiones*, written before 1236 and very possibly the later text, suggests the issue had increased in sensitivity.²⁹ Alexander devoted his eighth question to the Greek controversy on the dual procession, arguing that 'to proceed' had many meanings and supporting the Greeks on one of these. He explained his understanding of the Greek position as follows:

Let us understand the Holy Spirit as the common love of the Father and the Son: that love proceeds from the Father into the Son; hence it rests in him ...: it is brought to a conclusion in that one as it were in the one loved, because the other way round it does not proceed from the Son into the Father, although ... 'the Son loves the Father'. When therefore 'the Spirit of the Father' is said, the meaning is: love proceeding from the Father into the Son; but when 'the Spirit of the Son' is said, the meaning is: the love of the Son loving the Father, not as proceeding from him into the Father.

As a result, Alexander concluded, the Greeks had not 'conceded "the Spirit proceeds from the Son"', because that love does not proceed into the Father'. Indeed, perhaps in an attempt to rebut growing criticism of an authority he respected, Alexander specifically credited John Damascene with this explanation for denying the dual procession. Moreover, as Alexander went on to note, the Greek position on God as the source from which two rivers flowed meant that the Holy Spirit as the reciprocal love between Father and Son could not proceed from both – the Father's love could flow into the Son, but not vice versa. The use of the concept of reciprocal love in this way seems to misrepresent the Greek position, but it allowed Alexander to maintain the Latin while justifying the Greek view. This could suggest concern over the Greek arguments had grown since his *Glossa*, with theologians increasingly anxious to preserve the authorities they revered in the face of increased papal hostility to the Greeks and accusations of heresy.³⁰

The Greek question had certainly become more integral to the overall debate in Albertus Magnus' commentary on the *Sententiae* from the 1240s. Albertus followed Peter Lombard's account, but dealt with the Greeks more comprehensively, presenting and refuting thirteen arguments on their side. These covered several from pseudo-Dionysius, including, in similar vein to Alexander earlier, that the Father was the source of the deity, and the Son and Holy Spirit sacred rivers – no river arose at the same time from a source and from a river, so the Holy Spirit could not proceed from the Son, and vice versa; and from John Damascene and Gregory Nazianzen.³¹ Albertus concluded that denying the dual procession was an error and defending it was heresy: the saints who were the fathers of the councils said this, reason compelled it and the Gospel approved it. This statement was much stronger than any by Alexander of Hales or Peter Lombard. It may reflect a tightening of doctrine in the university following the condemnation, or indeed Gregory IX's description of the Greeks as heretics.³²

Like Peter Lombard and Alexander, Albertus continued by discussing other issues independently on the Latin agenda, such as whether the Holy Spirit proceeded earlier from the Father than from the Son. However, unlike his predecessors, he periodically reverted to the Greek arguments, out of the immediate context of Peter Lombard's discussion. This could, again, suggest that the Greeks were more of an issue in the 1240s than previously. For example, Albertus commented that Ambrose's words, as reported by Peter Lombard – that, 'according to his divinity, the Spirit is not upon Christ but in Christ' – seemed to indicate that the Greeks' opinion was true, that the Spirit was of Christ i.e. resting in him and proceeding immediately ['indistanter'] from the Father. Peter Lombard had expressed no such reservations, and Alexander did not pick up the reference.³³

In conclusion, articles two and three both appear to originate in internal Latin debate. Aristotle's *Categories*, and works based on them, in particular Boethius' *Theological Tractates* and Gilbert of Poitiers' commentary on these, were the main sources for article two. Later arrivals, particularly new Aristotelian concepts, could have influenced the debate, but the article's inclusion may well depend primarily on its link to article three. The picture for the latter is confused, with a strong internal debate in which the controversy with the Greeks over the dual procession figured, sometimes integrated, sometimes not, and to varying extents. However, Albertus Magnus' strong statement that not to defend the dual procession was heresy, together with continuing attempts to separate John Damascene from association with the Greek view, even to the extent of misrepresenting him, are evidence that hostility to the Greek interpretation of the Trinity was firmly on the Paris agenda by the time of the condemnation.

Article four: the empyrean heaven

Article four's antecedents are obscure. The issue itself apparently baffled Albertus Magnus and no texts directly reflecting its contents have emerged. Peter Lombard did not see where glorified spirits and bodies might dwell as a problem, although he discussed the composition and positioning of the various heavens.³⁴ Alexander of Hales' discussion showed that, by his time, the issue of corporeality was firmly on the agenda – the incorporeal nature of angels, with the corporeal empyrean as their place of creation, which they filled as soon as it was made, and their compatibility with corporeal humans, needed resolution.³⁵ By Albertus Magnus' time, these were serious concerns. Albertus was also the only one of the three to discuss Mary's place in heaven, but the concern was over her elevation, not downgrading.³⁶ In his earlier *De resurrectione*, Albertus noted that the empyrean heaven was a place common for all the blessed.³⁷

It is clear that the thirteenth century saw increasing discussion of the corporeal nature of the empyrean heaven, becoming linked to issues of time and motion and intensified in turn by the new Aristotelian texts and by Avicenna. Peter Lombard had discussed whether angels were circumscribed in time and place. Alexander of Hales developed this theme in his 1220s *Glossa*, citing John Damascene's definition of place and also using the concepts of potentiality and actuality:

John Damascene: ‘place is the corporeal limit of a thing which is contained’; but an angel does not have a corporeal limit; wherefore it will not be in a place. Against this, Augustine, in his book *De anima et spiritu* [ch.18]: “Therefore we call intellectual natures corporeal, because they are circumscribed in place” ... [A] spirit and a body are in a corporeal place differently, for a body is in a corporeal place according to passive potentiality, and a spirit according to active potentiality.³⁸

Albertus Magnus in his 1240s commentary on the *Sententiae* asked three questions about the empyrean heaven: whether it was a body; if so, whether it was uniform or mobile (‘mobile’); and, if not mobile, what its relationship was with lower spheres.³⁹ Arguments in favour of it being a body included various points on place, uniformity and movement, and, conclusively for Albertus, the words of the saints as revealed to them by the Holy Spirit. But the counter-arguments, while including Augustine saying, and Bede implying, that the empyrean heaven was God, were heavily influenced by the new learning, starting with Aristotle’s view, probably drawn from his *Physics* [VIII, 9–10], that place and the thing located in it share the same nature, because ‘the Philosopher willed that there would be the same movement in respect of place and form, and the same mover. But only the spiritual substance is located in the empyrean heaven, and so the empyrean must be a spiritual not a corporeal substance’.⁴⁰

Corporeality and its implications for the positioning, construction and inhabitants of the various heavens had also been a concern in Philip the Chancellor’s 1230s *Summa de Bono*, with Philip likewise applying the principles from the new learning to his discussion. Issues included whether that heaven, which he stated John Damascene called the holding place of visible and invisible creatures, containing the intellectual virtues of angels and all sensible things, was mobile. If it was mobile, everything mobile was mobile because of something. The firmament was mobile because of the need of those contained in it; likewise heaven would be mobile from the need of those in it. But separated substances (as Philip called angels) did not suffer need. Again, everything below the firmament which was mobile was mobile in time. Therefore if heaven was mobile, the sempiternal substances which were properly contained by it would be in time and not in the aevum. Moreover, quantity (‘quantitas’) properly existed because of mobility. But if existence was dependent on mobility (which was temporal), to the extent that heaven was immobile, it could not exist. In response, Philip accepted that all quantity existed because of mobility, but to varying extents. He distinguished different types of quantity, of which the fourth would not be mobile as itself, but the mobility of things belonging to it might be distinguished – and he asserted that the empyrean heaven was of this kind. Mobility might, therefore, be said to belong to it, and it could contain not just spirits but spiritual bodies.⁴¹ This convoluted argument demonstrates the problems caused by the issue of corporeality for the empyrean heaven’s inhabitants.

William of Auvergne’s discussion in his 1230s *De universo* also focused on issues related to corporeality. During a long discussion on the various heavens, he noted two uses of the empyrean heaven, as ‘the most joyous habitation of men’

and as ‘the completion/fulfilment, or perfection of the bodily universe’. In an important passage, he continued:

Some adduce a third [use] from theologians, saints and doctors, namely, the habitation of angels, saying that heaven, as soon as it was created, was filled with angels. And truly this involves a difficult question. For if that heaven is a bodily place, it could only be filled with bodies of substance. For spiritual substances, just as they also do not have corporeal magnitude, thus neither could they fill a place. Further, how can substances of this kind pertain to a corporeal habitation? For just as bodies have no relation to spiritual habitations, so spirits, or spiritual substances, have no relation to corporeal habitations.

William claimed such arguments allowed ‘the unlearned (‘imperiti’) mock at the holy words and writings, which are genuine and drawn from divine revelations’.⁴² The reference to the ‘unlearned’ is tantalising. If William was intending to ridicule his unidentified targets, it could refer to heretics (although William often identified these by name), or perhaps to Parisian arts students beguiled by philosophy.

If man’s intrinsic corporeality was the issue, Catharism, with its belief that the body was evil, is a candidate for article four’s derivation – glorified bodies could never qualify for heaven. Cathars would also support downgrading the Virgin Mary. Moreover, one sect (from Concorezzo, northern Italy) was believed to have held that the souls of Mary, the apostles and the saints would not be in glory until Judgment Day. However, there appears to be no evidence that this belief was widespread, and the aqueous and crystalline heavens did not figure as alternative residences in any heretical texts found in this study. Moreover, it would be odd for Albertus Magnus not to name them, when expressing his apparent bafflement in his commentary on the *Sententiae*.⁴³

The location of souls prior to Judgment Day was also an issue in discussions on whether Purgatory existed. Initially the question seems to have resulted from differing interpretations of biblical texts which could suggest a delay before wholly good souls reached heaven. Guerric of St.-Quentin noted:

Angels have a double place, the meritorious and those without merit, namely the empyrean heaven and the dark and gloomy (‘caliginosum’) ether ... But man only has one place of merit and demerit ... the earth; and therefore immediately when he is deprived [of life] (‘exutus’), if his soul craved earthly things ... so the mind will be drawn together to belong to it; similarly ... the good soul [arises] to heaven after the gates were opened by Christ.

Guerric argued that the souls of the blessed were able to ascend immediately because of Christ’s redemption. He continued:

To that which seems the opposite in Dives and Lazarus [Lk. xvi:19–31], we say that very many books do not have that gloss. If however it is [true],

we say that it makes a simple account, since the bosom of Abraham, in which Lazarus was, is called bosom ('sinus'), that is, protection from all evils, that is, a secure place although lacking reward ... Hence, those in security will be in a similar secure place.⁴⁴

Purgatory also featured in Albertus Magnus' *Commentary*, but, in contrast to Gueric, the context was Greek doctrine and eastern philosophy. Albertus argued the idea of the souls of the damned living on earth until Judgment Day was an error of the modern Greeks. He considered it heretical to say that human souls should remain on earth, but he accepted they might appear without remaining. Moving to philosophical views, the theory that human souls did not descend into hell as their perpetual residence was a heresy held by many people of the east, deriving ultimately from Pythagoras and Plato. Albertus described such views as simply and totally errors, providing opportunities for idolaters purporting to summon the souls of men through demons. He commented that Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* was founded on such an error.⁴⁵

A Greek connection to article four, to match that for article three, is attractive. However, it seems unlikely, as their objection of purgatory was to any interim location – souls go immediately to either heaven or hell. Moreover, they would have rejected the future exclusion of glorified bodies. Equally, a connection with classical philosophy or indeed idolatry is unconvincing.

In conclusion, given the lack of contemporary texts containing the proposition in article four, the reason for its inclusion in the condemnation is particularly difficult to pin down. None of the texts cited above address the issue squarely, although a Cathar connection is possible. However, many theologians were clearly fascinated by the location and constitution of the various heavens, or layers of heaven, both in their nature (whether corporeal or incorporeal, fiery, identical to God, etc.) and in their inhabitants. Discussions on the empyrean heaven and its inhabitants took place in this wider context. More specifically, corporeality, and hence – despite the article's apparent focus on humans – the nature of angels, was clearly important, with the empyrean's explicit description as 'locus corporalis' significant. William of Auvergne identified this as a major issue, referring to the 'unlearned' in a way that implied they were contemporary, and Albertus Magnus' remark that he did not know the reason why some people, possibly contemporaries, favoured the aqueous heaven for humans could be disingenuous. However, the most that can safely be said is that, while such concerns were long-standing, the new Aristotelian texts raised scientific and philosophical issues that exacerbated the difficulties and could have contributed to the article's inclusion.

Articles five and ten: the origin of evil and Satan's and Adam's fall

Although separated in the condemnation by four intervening articles, the issues underlying articles five and ten were very similar. Both tackled the origin of evil, article five in respect of angelic creation and article ten of the fall of both angels and humans. Both raised fundamental issues, including freewill in the face of a

prescient God: how an all-good, omniscient and omnipotent God could create something he knew would turn to evil; and whether (and, if so, why) God withheld his grace from some, or all, of the angels. These are vast issues, with the area as a whole generating significant discussion and different views. However, fewer than ten questions in Douai, MS 434, cover issues directly related to either article, although the question of sin generally, and specific sins in particular, was an overriding concern, with around eighty-two entries dealing with appetites, vices and sins (albeit sixty-seven of these concerned the individual vices). Only two (Questions 226 and 227) appear to relate specifically to the fall of Satan and the angels, and six (Questions 17, 151–3, 446 and 563) to Adam's temptation and first sin.⁴⁶

The starting point for discussion of both articles was, once again, biblical interpretation. The predominantly 'home-grown' nature of the debate is clear. Augustine was a prime authority, although his statements were sometimes themselves problematic. For example, Peter Lombard cited his argument that 'not without cause it may be held that the devil fell from the beginning of time and never stood in the truth', and that this had led some to think the devil 'was created in [a state of] wickedness, albeit by God'; while others believed all angels were created good, and there was a small delay between creation and fall, during which they could stand firm but not progress without the superaddition of grace.⁴⁷ Citing Origen, Peter Lombard favoured a small but very brief delay:

The enemy serpent is opposed to truth, but he was not so from the beginning ... Just as Adam and Eve did not immediately sin, so also the serpent was for a while not a serpent, when he remained in ... paradise ... For God did not make wickedness.

Peter Lombard's interpretation of Jn. viii:44 then linked Satan and Adam in terms very similar to article ten:

And he [Satan] did not *stand in the truth* because he was never in it, but he committed apostasy *from the beginning* of time, that is, from the moment of the making of man, whom through envy he cast into death and seduced by deceit. And so ... it is clear that all angels were created good, and that, after their creation, some fell away from the good which they would have had, if they had remained steadfast.⁴⁸

Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* followed similar lines to Peter Lombard's, but used Greek authorities such as John Damascene, as well as Augustine, Origen (again), Boethius (for the distinction between 'id quod' and 'id quo'), Isidore, Anselm and many others. For example, on whether some angels were created evil, Alexander cited John Damascene saying:

The devil was not made bad by nature, but existing as good and born in the good, and by no means having in himself the path of evil from the Founder

... was turned by the choice of his own freewill from that which is according to nature to that which is beyond nature ('praeter naturam').⁴⁹

The reference to 'beyond nature' may have reflected the patristic and Neoplatonic idea of evil as outside nature, not existing in its own right, although Alexander did not describe it specifically as the deprivation of good.

Alexander also added Aristotelian concepts. These included the categories of causation – for example, Alexander described the reasons for Satan's sin as his elevation (the formal cause), quietude without service (the final cause), his beauty and strength (the material cause), and his likeness to God (the efficient cause). On whether a state of innocence existed for angels when first created, he noted as one opposing argument, possibly based on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*:

But against, it seems there will not be a state of innocence at that time; and this seems false, because both in their nature there is a middle between good and bad, and [there is a middle] in the very nature of good and evil, as is said in the *Moralia* [on *Job*] ...⁵⁰

Albertus Magnus' discussion focused on whether angels were created in grace or in simple nature, concluding that 'the opinion of the saints is that angelic creation was in grace'. He questioned whether God could actually have created the angel as evil, and whether the evil angel could have sinned in the first moment of time – and he noted the view that the angel, if he did not have grace, immediately inclined to evil, and therefore sinned from the first moment of his creation, although 'it seems this is heresy'. While more sophisticated, and set in a wider context (for example, the difference between angels and separated substances, where he strongly opposed the equation made by Maimonides and others), Albertus' specific discussion on the issues in articles five and ten again relied heavily on earlier Latin authorities. But the influence of both Aristotle and Neoplatonism is visible. For example, on when angels became evil, Albertus offered one argument favouring this being immediate:

The state-of-having-been-made ('factum esse') itself is measured by the indivisible now: therefore everything made is in the now, and is made and moved in time; if therefore at any time someone evil was made, and that state-of-having-been-made is also in the indivisible now: either therefore the state-of-having-been-made-bad and the angelic state-of-having-been-made are in the same indivisible [now], and then I understand the proposition ('habeo propositum'). Or they are in different [nows], and then, since between any two nows is an intermediate time, there will be some time in which he himself [i.e. the angel] was made and is neither good nor bad.

However, Albertus continued,

this could not be: since every creature is from nothing: therefore it inclines to nothing by its own weight and weakness/need ('defectu') unless lifted up

by grace; therefore he [the angel] inclined to nothing, and therefore he sinned since this is to incline to nothing.

This argument appears to be based on Aristotelian views on time, coupled with a Neoplatonic belief that evil was the deprivation of good and therefore nothing. On this, Albertus argued:

[E]vil is from nothing: but man can incline to evil, and not incline, because it is voluntary, not natural; and nature itself, although it is from nothing, nevertheless does not have everything from nothing which is the beginning/principle of its own existence, but has its whole essence from God, and therefore can stand in him.⁵¹

Albertus also noted and rejected Aristotle's view that, whereas an intellect was always right, a phantasm ('phantasia') could be right or wrong. This would mean that an angel, only moved by intellect, not appetite, could not sin.⁵² More generally, Albertus' arguments on all the issues, including the related ones of freewill and grace, indicate the intractability of the issues and that there was no unified view on them. His discussion suggests the whole debate was still very much alive at the university even some years after the date of the condemnation, with new arguments added but more or less stuck in the same groove.⁵³

In contrast, William of Auvergne focused his arguments on the issues in articles five and ten firmly on dualism, demonstrating that, for him at least, while the arguments went back a long way, the more immediate concern was over contemporary heretics (who he usually called Manichees). His attack on dualism occupied all the first part of the first principal section of *De universo*. William argued that, if evil people acted through necessity, not choice (as under his interpretation of dualism), they should not be blamed; that the 'first evil was the privation or lack of the first natural good, that is, of being'; 'the first gratuitous evil, that is, one opposite to grace, was the lack of first grace'; and that 'in angelic substances ... the first grace is that noble knowledge of God ... and in this way the first evil, that is harm, in intelligent substances is a turning away of thought or of knowledge from the creator'. Such arguments established to William's satisfaction that evil could come from good and provided the basis for arguing, in the case of 'the bad angel', that he was created good but became evil – anything else would necessitate that God created evil, that Satan was bad through necessity, not choice, and that evil could be a first principle in itself.⁵⁴ His specific discussion of 'the malice of the bad angels' followed later, in the third part of the second principal section of *De universo*. The whole question of angels and demons clearly fascinated him. However, throughout these various passages, his treatment of the bad angel and the angels' move to evil appears almost a side issue to his primary concern over the Cathar belief in two first principles.⁵⁵ Peter Lombard's earlier treatment of the angels' fall, and his discussion of a (minimal) delay between creation and fall, was more direct.

In conclusion, there can be no doubt that dualism was directly relevant to articles five and ten, and it seems likely that it influenced their inclusion. As well

as William of Auvergne's total focus on the rebuttal of contemporary dualism, other theologians also referred explicitly to it in the context of their analyses. For example, commenting on Augustine's discussion on John's saying [1.Jn vii:44] that 'the devil sins from the beginning', Alexander of Hales argued that anyone who did not know that the devil rejected justice from the time of his making shared the ignorance of those heretics, the Manichaeans, who believed the devil was the first principle of evil. Although Augustine was referring to dualists of his time, Alexander's equation with contemporary heretics is clear.⁵⁶ Moreover, the possible presence of Cathars at the university raises the prospect that rebutting their ideas was an internal, not merely an external, need, with the Dominicans also alerted to and familiar with the danger in Toulouse.

However, while dualism represented one solution to the origin of evil, it was a symptom of the issue, not its cause – the perceived doctrinal threat from the Cathars might have sharpened the debate, making it more aggressive, but it did not create it. Indeed, dualism does not seem to have figured to any major extent, if at all, in discussions specifically on Adam's fall, the issue in article ten.⁵⁷ Articles five and ten represented major issues for Christianity, and the debate underlying them clearly had its own internal momentum, without necessarily requiring an external stimulus. It is not surprising, therefore, that the area received extensive coverage in thirteenth-century texts, sometimes as an attack on dualism, but also frequently in its own right as a fundamental issue of faith with no explicit reference to dualism. While no texts suggest that theologians at the university at Paris were dualists, some evidently denied any gap between angelic creation and fall. The complexity and difficulty of the discussion in the various texts, with differing views expressed, suggests the underlying issues were internal, albeit made more pressing by the need to combat heresy.

Given the use of the new learning from Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics* to inform the debate, it is possible they also influenced the articles' inclusion in the condemnation. However, they do not seem to have made a decisive difference. Where Aristotle's views could have caused more concern was their use by dualists to support their case, but this brings the issue back to dualism and only indirectly to the new texts themselves.⁵⁸

There is one final potential consideration. Article ten referred to Adam, reflecting the literal *Genesis* account. Eriugena offered a lengthy allegorical interpretation, including paradise as 'human nature made in the image of God', 'the tree of mixed knowledge' as 'the indiscriminating or confused hankering of the carnal senses ...', man as 'mind ...', woman as 'the sense, to which if mind incautiously consent, it is lost' and the serpent as 'the forbidden pleasure ...'. Maimonides' *Guide* was likewise allegorical and was criticised by both Jews and Christians on this basis (although some Jewish sages took a similar approach, as Maimonides' comments demonstrated). Moreover, as debated at the 1240 Talmud trial, the Talmud evidently contained an interpretation of the story, including Adam's relationship with Lilith, which Christians found objectionable.⁵⁹ Such allegorical or embellished interpretation clearly offended theologians at Paris. While this would not in itself have generated article ten's offending proposition, it could, possibly, have fuelled concern, increasing the topic's sensitivity.

Article six: angelic movement and location

Discussions on angels were profuse and wide-ranging in this period. Douai, MS 434, includes around thirty-two discussions on angelic powers and roles. Although none are identifiable from the list as discussing the exact issue of angelic placement contained in article six (indeed, only four discuss angelic movement generally), this may have been a sub-topic in some.

As regards the concern underlying article six, Peter Lombard's discussion of this issue in the context of God's primacy (in the first book of his *Sententiae*) rather than within his discussion on angelic nature (in the second), suggests God's primacy was the real issue. Peter Lombard relied mainly on Latin authorities. He cited Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate*, that 'a man, or something similar, when he is in one place, will not be in another place, because what is in one place is contained in that place where its bodily form is ...'. He also cited Ambrose, *De Spiritu sancto*, who contrasted a creature 'bounded by the certain limits of its own nature', with that of the Holy Spirit, 'who does not have a circumscribed and determined power, who is always in all things and everywhere'. Peter Lombard concluded:

On the created spirit: that in one way it is neither local nor circumscribable, and in another way it is [both]; but the body is entirely local and circumscribable, and God is entirely un-local and un-circumscribable. And so each body is entirely local; but a created spirit is local in one way and not local in some other way. It is said to be local because it is bounded by a definition of place since, when it is entirely present in one place, it is not found elsewhere; but it is not local in the sense of taking on a dimension that separates [itself] off in space.⁶⁰

These statements may have set the parameters for subsequent debate. However, with increasing access to texts beyond the Latin authorities, the issue became both more complex and more problematic. Alexander of Hales introduced Greek authorities, in particular John Damascene. He commented:

John Damascene ...: 'The angel is said to be in a place, because he is present and will be circumscribed intelligibly ('intelligibiliter') where he works. For he cannot operate in different places in respect of the same thing'. From this it seems that the spiritual creature is moved not only through time but also through place.

In response, using Aristotle's theory that only things with parts could move through place, Alexander argued that an angel 'is said to be moved not through place, because what is moved properly through place has parts, of which one is in its starting place but the other in its destination'. Hence,

since the angel is simple, it is not said to be moved through space; nonetheless, it is moved from place to place. For 'through' ('per') reflects the middle

through which it is passed right through; 'from' ('de') and 'to' ('ad') reflect the termini.

In an argument illustrating some of the related complexities, Alexander explained why a created spirit could not share a place with other created spirits, because 'they are constituted according to a single mode in respect of being in a place'. Reasons he rejected included that it was because it was a spirit (otherwise an angel or the Holy Spirit could not share a place with a soul); or because it was created (otherwise a soul could not share with its body, or a created spirit or body with an uncreated one).⁶¹

Complications multiplied with Albertus Magnus. He picked up the same arguments as Alexander and added new ones – and he often cited both John Damascene and the new Aristotelian texts. His discussion on angelic movement referred explicitly to Aristotle:

[I]n angels movement is not of this kind ...: since, as can be understood from the Philosopher in *Physics* VIII, the thing generating and the thing moving are the same in respect of place; because the thing generating gives its own form to the thing generated, it gives to the latter all the accidents that follow that form; and the foremost among those accidents is local movement ...⁶²

Albertus' discussion on whether an angel's movement was in time, which incorporated the issue in article six, is particularly important in assessing the underlying influences. His references included Aristotle, Avicenna, Averroes and Maimonides. Albertus concluded that, 'because of its inherent difficulty there are many opinions on the question, of which some heretical ones are now held by the moderns'. He continued with a list of such views, starting with 'certain philosophers [who], in explaining the Old Testament in respect of the sending forth of angels, such as Rabbi Moyses [Maimonides], Rabbi Eliesur and Rabbi Joanna, say angels are moved, but all powers ('virtutes') obey them as far as their command; and therefore they say they are moved through the effect of those powers obeying; and this (because it is contrary to sacred Scripture) is heresy'. Second in Albertus' list, and most relevant to article six,

[t]here are others, who say that the angel is at the same time in many places ... and even to be in all places [at the same time] if he wishes; and this is held to be heresy, since he should have substance according to the words of the saints, and could not be in many places at the same time.

Then, there are others who say that an angel's

movement is through his own will, and he is moved in the now if he wants, and he is moved in time if he wants. Others say that he is moved, not in the now, but in imperceptible time, which is to be moved instantaneously

(‘repente’); and therefore ... he is moved in the now. Others say that he is moved in one now according to two ways: ...

Albertus concluded that ‘there are no two [views] perfectly in agreement on this question’.⁶³ His reference to ‘moderns’, some of whom believed angels could be in different places at the same time, suggests that, even after the condemnation, this proposition still had its adherents, although now considered heretical.

In conclusion, the citations – from Peter Lombard onwards – of Latin authorities such as Ambrose of Milan, demonstrate the issue’s origin in Latin debate, influenced by the Greek Fathers and representing long-standing concerns. The fact that angels were incorporeal – and so did not suffer the same constraints as humans in motion and location – generated discussion about the movement of such substances which went back long before the arrival of any new texts. This was also the case with the ostensibly innocuous distinction made by the Church Fathers between low-level guardian angels and higher-ranking ones whose remit involved their multi-presence to do God’s will – a distinction picked up by, for example, Guerric of St.-Quentin.⁶⁴ However, angelic issues appear to have gathered momentum and complexity after Peter Lombard, with angelic movement, location and existence in time becoming tantamount to text-book topics for thirteenth-century theologians – the subject presented new pitfalls arising from Aristotle’s *Physics* and the works of Maimonides, Avicenna and Averroes.

Moreover, the question of why this one aspect of angelic nature was chosen out of a much longer potential list may be significant. It appears to have been less discussed than some of the other angelic conundrums. However, if combined with the equation of angels with intelligences by Avicenna, Maimonides and others, and the concern, stemming largely from Neoplatonism, that they encroached on God’s own powers, the choice makes sense. It was not only the technicalities that were the issue, although they remained important, but the theological implications for God’s unique nature. Although Peter Lombard appeared to recognise this, the newly translated texts could have increased concerns considerably.

Finally, apart from the combination of Neoplatonist and Aristotelian theories, dualism is another candidate for article six’s inclusion. However, no specific Cathar doctrines on this have emerged in this study, although Satan’s elevation by extreme dualists to equality with God, and hence presumably usurping his omnipresence, could have increased concerns, even if subliminally. Avicenna’s argument that an angel had only one instantiation at any given time could also be relevant, but it did not figure directly in any of the texts examined in this study, although Alexander of Hales’ reference to their constitution ‘according to a single mode in respect of being in a place’, is intriguing. Last, how to explain Christ’s real presence in the Eucharist caused problems – for example, Alexander argued for a separate classification for Christ’s body – and this issue was sometimes linked to angelic location.⁶⁵ However, while these three additional contexts could all be relevant, it seems unlikely they were dominant concerns.

Article seven: eternal truths that are not God

Chapter 2 listed four inter-linked strands potentially underlying article seven, as set out in Alexander of Hales' quaestio and Godefrid of Bléneau's quodlibet. These were: mathematical concepts or Platonic ideas, with a read-across to angels; stateables; God's knowledge (an issue implicit in, and underpinning, the first two strands); and, possibly, the multiplicity of the Trinity.

The first strand was perhaps potentially the most subversive doctrinally. However, the second and third strands seem to have caused particularly complex problems for theologians, especially since article seven's wording refers to truths 'from eternity' without qualification. This possibly closed what could otherwise have been a loophole for some scholars who saw a difference between something being from eternity and God knowing it from eternity, with the element of eternity stemming from God, not from the thing known. However, given the article's compressed wording, there may have been some leeway here. The complexity and contentious nature of the issues underlying the second and third strands are clear from Douai, MS 434, where at least sixteen questions have truth as their single main issue. For example: Question 443 principally concerns whether there are more truths created which are in things or only one truth created, which is not in things; the summary notes: '*Expl.*: just as the truth of intellectual reason ('rationis') is in speech ('oratione') according to the Philosopher'; Question 550 asks about human nature, including, as its third and fourth questions, whether truth is changeable and whether there are many truths or one; Question 559 principally concerns whether there are many created truths which are in things or only one truth, namely, uncreated truth, which is not in things; and Question 560 discusses whether truth is eternal or created – it notes that Anselm proved it was eternal.⁶⁶

Mathematical concepts or Platonic ideas

This issue had a long history in Latin thought, with Alexander quoting both Augustine and Anselm in the first limb of his quaestio, and it figured in many patristic and contemporary discussions.⁶⁷ It concerned ideas as truths *per se*, potentially existing outside God, and their role. There appear to have been three underlying stages, with escalating concern. First, numerical concepts or truths were identified with Platonic ideas, possibly separate from God. Second, what such ideas represented, or could represent, first in classical Greek philosophy and then in Christian doctrine, became a major concern. Finally, by the 1230s and 1240s, with a backwards look at the classical tradition, and a sideways look at theories coming from Neoplatonism and Jewish and Arab philosophy, there was the potential extrapolation of such ideas into intelligences or even angels, threatening God's role as the sole eternal being and the sole creator.

The way the theory developed throws light on how the concerns grew. First, Augustine equated mathematical concepts, which must be eternally true, with Plato's ideas, preferring to translate them as 'rationes' (the Greek 'logoi') rather

than 'formae' or 'species'. Plato's ideas, as the eternal, original, independent and principal forms of things, comprised, with the so-called demiurge and matter in his *Timaeus*, the three sources for creation. However, whether they existed in a higher mind was open to interpretation. Augustine placed them in the divine intelligence – God – and this view was carried across to the works of some medieval theologians as being Plato's own, together with their equation with the eternally true mathematical concepts, i.e. eternal truths.⁶⁸ For example, in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, Albertus Magnus expanded on Peter Lombard's discussion of Plato's three principles, implying Peter thought Augustine's view came from Plato and stating that the proposition did not seem absurd:

For in the first book of the *Sententiae* it was said that Plato placed the ideas ('ideas') in the divine mind, as Augustine said in his 83 *Quaestiones*: whoever denies these, denies the existence of the Son of God: therefore it seems this position is not inconsistent. Again, Boethius in the introduction to his *Arithmetica*, book I, said: 'That founder God had first the science of numbers of this human mass as the exemplar of his own principle/reason ...'. But it is agreed that the thing referred to cannot be understood in respect of mathematical number; therefore it must be understood about the ideal number which precedes all ideas/prototypes ('ideata')...⁶⁹

Plato's ideas, and what they consisted of, figured large in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Christian theological works – but were initially not linked to intelligences or angels. Thus, while Peter Lombard spent considerable time stressing God's role as sole creator with no separate eternal entities alongside him, voicing particular concern over angels having such a role, he did not link his references to Plato to angels. Similarly, Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* discussed in detail the meaning of the various terms 'create' etc., making clear that only God could create, not angels. However, he did not specifically discuss Plato's view or link angels with ideas, although his concern over the threat that misinterpretation of the nature of angels posed to Christian orthodoxy seems stronger than Peter Lombard's. Nonetheless, both Peter and Alexander remained troubled by the common belief that wisdom, one of the Platonic ideas and thus an eternal truth, referred to the angelic nature. Moreover, Alexander specifically asked whether creation was through an 'exemplar' and what an exemplar was, although he quickly concluded this title properly belonged to the Son.⁷⁰

By the 1240s both the nature and level of concern had changed significantly. This appears to have stemmed from the equation of Platonic ideas first with Neoplatonic intelligences or intellects, and, following this, even more perilously for Christian belief, with angels. The equation with angels was made by Arab and Jewish philosophers, who gave an enlarged role to such intelligences, including quasi-creative and controlling powers (as found in works such as the *Liber de causis*). Albertus Magnus accordingly first wanted to emphasise that Platonic ideas were not eternal forms distinct from God. He accused Plato of four errors:

First, he thought God's knowledge, as that of other things, to be caused from those things, and that there are forms in God distinct from God's intellect, which Aristotle disproved in book XI of his *Prima philosophia* [*Metaphysics*]. Second, he thought those things not only were in God, but also generated beings with him according to nature in their own particular forms. And he posited them to be from eternity with God: because he did not see how the proximate causes could give birth to another form which would not be of its own species. Third, because he said not only that it was thus, but also that mathematics were within those things which were abstracted from natural things, and they are the beginning of knowledge in these things which have knowledge of things ... Fourth, because he himself posited that those forms remained in bodies, even with the particulars destroyed in which they are; because it must be one thing to be a particular and another to be of those forms.

Albertus stated that these errors were 'collected from different books of Aristotle who imputed them to him; and it seems to be drawn forth from the *Timaeus*, as is clear to someone looking at the chapter[s] [30–52] about *gods of the gods*'. He noted that 'to posit ideas in this way from eternity is heresy, and so Plato sinned by positing exemplars or ideas'.⁷¹

Albertus's concern over Platonic ideas then focussed on their possible equation with intelligences or angels, with all that this entailed. This concern was clear in the first book of his commentary on the *Sententiae*, when he noted some philosophers, including Jews, believed that 'all the powers ('virtutes') obey them', describing this as heresy.⁷² But his main discussion came in the second book. First, Albertus accused philosophers of maintaining that intelligences were eternal and had a role in creation, either in their own right or as God's agents – often equating them with angels – sometimes in the context of Platonic forms, sometimes at large. On the specific question of their identification with angels, he stated:

Thus Avicenna said that intelligences are those things which the people and those speaking in law call angels. Again, Algazel said the same before the end of his *Metaphysics*. Again, Rabbi Moses [Maimonides] said this in his ... *Dux neutrorum* [*Guide for the Perplexed*] ... Fourth, the philosophers posit intelligences as separated substances, and we call angels spiritual separated substances: therefore we mean the same by angels as they mean by intelligences ... Fifth, the intellectual substance does not have anything before it in the order of the universe according to the philosophers except the prime cause; but we say the same about angels; therefore it seems that we understand the same by angels as they do by intelligences.⁷³

Moreover, Albertus noted that, according to the *Liber de causis*, 'it seems that an intelligence is full of forms, and therefore the same would be the case with angels, although according to our interpretation ('intentio'), an intelligence is not an angel'. Albertus' preferred solution was that 'the angel in the beginning of his own creation received the species of the whole order of natural causes,

both specific and general, and those are applicable to everything which is made in nature; and thus with those things as intermediaries he knows everything he wishes, except only what is retained in the freewill'. Albertus favoured this view because he 'understands it better' and, 'although containing difficulties, it has fewer unsuitable consequences'. At the same time, he also warned:

Care should be taken, because philosophers talking about intelligences posit them to be causes; for intelligences are full of forms which are able to be displayed through the motion of whatever orb, inasmuch as it is full of forms, is desired by the mover of the orb, and moves itself as the desired thing [moves] the thing desiring; and therefore the intelligence of the prime order has forms more universal and simple ... and an intelligence of the second order will be full of forms which can be displayed by the twofold circular oblique motion and less universal, and so on.

But, Albertus continued, 'we say this is ridiculous: because we do not speak thus ('sic') about angels, but we rather posit them as separated substances, not determined in respect of anything mobile; and we therefore say that they have forms which the Creator gave them to know the things of this world ...'. Such forms were similar but not the same as ideas: similar, because, for example, 'they are the principles of the things which are known through them'; but different because, for example, 'they are not operative as ideas in God'.⁷⁴

Outside the *Sententiae* and associated commentaries, concern over the precise role of ideas had previously surfaced in Philip the Chancellor's discussion of Plato's exemplar in his *Summa de bono* from the 1230s. Philip argued that Plato did not posit an eternal principle which was a form (such as the world soul), but rather an eternal exemplar and thus not from the genus of form. He explained that Plato, when he divided ideas from images, called idea ('ydea') eternal, but he did not call image ('ydon') eternal, which he called 'the world soul'. Philip cited Augustine's statement:

'It would not be fitting for reasons/principles ('rationes') or ideas ('ydee') which are eternal and immutable, participation in which happens so that something exists, in whatever way it is, to be posited except in God, and except as they are received by things themselves.' And from this it seems that there are many ideas, since there is a multitude of things containing ideas ('ydeatorum').

But Philip denied there were many ideas, given the utter simplicity of God's essence.⁷⁵

Stateables ('enuntiabilia')

This was the second argument listed in Alexander's quaestio and referred to by Godefroid of Bléneau. William of Auvergne's complex and wide-ranging

discussion on truth in relation to stateables included the specific issue of whether they were eternal truths that were not God. The concern here focused on the alleged eternal nature of 'stateables' as grammatical concepts and the implications for God if their truth-values could change. Attributing such changes in knowledge to God would insult him, as William explained:

But another most stupid ('stultissima') opinion ... gave cause and occasion to this error – that by which they held that stateables, that is, all truths and falsities, existed from eternity, and have their manner of existing by themselves apart from creatures and from all works of God, and were not made or created by the creator, but are eternal and existed from eternity and, for this reason, owe nothing to the creator in terms of their being or their well-being.

William had no hesitation in dismissing this view. He questioned how such [stateables] could be from eternity when composed of subjects and predicates, which were 'certainly temporal and for the most part began in time': 'how did they precede their parts not only in time, but by eternity, especially since they were composed – and not [composed] by the creator nor by themselves'.⁷⁶

The truth value of 'stateables' was a major issue in the twelfth century, resulting from divisions between 'realists' and 'nominalists'. William accepted that some 'stateables' had been true from eternity, but not that they were therefore eternal entities.

The anonymous work *Ars meliduna* may, perhaps, be the source of William's discussion, since it contained much of what William claimed its proponents believed (including the existence from eternity of 'voces' as well as 'enuntiabilia'). It argued:

Some simple utterances ('voces'), i.e. elements ('elementes'), always existed just as also skills ('artes'), since they have their being from nature, not from the position of men; for they existed from eternity ('ab eterno'), just as also some true stateables ('enuntiabilia vera') ... [T]his does not mean they are the same as God, since only God is from eternity, because being or being from eternity ('ab aeterno') are said in one way about God, in another about utterances, in another about substances.⁷⁷

While the author did not expand significantly on this point, the resemblance with William's account, although not identical, is strong.

How William might have come across the theories in the *Ars meliduna* and from the nominalist and realist controversy is unclear, but it could have been while studying logic as an arts student at Paris. However, whether his concern when writing *De universo* was historic, or such views persisted in either the arts or theology faculties (or both) immediately preceding the condemnation, is unclear, as is who held William's scorned 'another most stupid opinion'. Nevertheless, similar discussions by other thirteenth-century theologians demonstrate that stateables were seen as a significant and difficult contemporary issue. These include

Robert Grosseteste in two early works, *De veritate* and *De libero arbitrio*, probably both written at Oxford in the early 1220s. His arguments influenced Richard Rufus, who quoted from *De libero arbitrio* in his *Metaphysics*, prior to 1228.⁷⁸

William's solution to the issue – which set out his understanding of the basis of both the error and the correct view – was long and complex, involving Aristotle's causes, the distinction between potentiality and actuality, and Avicenna.⁷⁹ However, while it relied on arguments drawn from the new learning, these represented ways to solve the problem; they did not create or exacerbate it. William set out six meanings of truth. The sixth, most relevant to article seven, stated:

[T]hose things that have been enunciated and are called true or propositions are true, and this, Avicenna says [*Metaphysics*, I.6], is the adequation of speech and things, that is, of affirmation and negation [and things] ... An utterance, therefore, is true by which what it is, is said to be, or what is not, is said not to be ... The agreement or concordance of the stateable and the statement is the truth of both, and the contrary or its privation is the falsity of both ... [so] it is evident that truth and falsity according to these intentions are like relations or comparisons of compositions and divisions with their affirmations and negations, and the truth and falsity of affirmations and negations are comparisons or relations or references to the compositions and divisions of the things they signify.⁸⁰

A critical argument William advanced was that when stateables were said to be true, what was said about their affirmations or negations was 'not understood in terms of act, but in terms of potency'.⁸¹ His position is perhaps best summarised when he stated:

[I]t is evident that there have been from eternity many diverse and varied truths that are completely independent of each other. I mean many contingent truths about the future. But nothing existed from eternity except the creator.⁸²

This might appear a self-contradictory assertion; but, despite allowing that there had been many independent truths from eternity, it designated these as merely 'contingent' and confirmed that only the creator *existed* from eternity.

In conclusion, the debate on whether stateables were eternal truths seems largely to date back to the twelfth century, and no one advocating such a view in the thirteenth century appears to have been securely identified. However, the attention that William of Auvergne and others devoted to it suggest they saw it as a continuing threat, and developed arguments to rebut it from the new Aristotelian, and related, texts.

God's knowledge

This was the third argument in favour of eternal truths which were not God, and the last on Alexander's list in his quaestio. Godefroid of Bléneau's quodlibet on

truth also touched on this area. It covered two issues. First, there was the numerical issue – whether, given there are multiple ideas of things on earth, God had multiple ideas in his mind/essence. Second, there was the ontological issue – whether what God knew *was* his mind/essence or *within* it. While, for all the options, the ideas were ostensibly part of God, any version positing multiple ideas could imply their eternal separate or quasi-separate existence, and thus underpinned arguments both on ideas and on stateables as eternal truths.

The number of Christian texts from Augustine onwards which discussed God's knowledge – what it was and how he knew – was huge, involving the critical issue of how God could be entirely simple while at the same time knowing and caring for every individual. There were three main strands influencing Paris theologians, divisible roughly into three periods (although, as ever, the access of the early Church Fathers to a wider range of classical texts confused the position). First, from Boethius onwards, there was the Platonic view of ideas and the demiurge in the *Timaeus*. Second, from the late twelfth century, Neoplatonic interpretations of Plato's view became influential, with a single being from whom all things emanated and reverted. Finally, the new texts from the end of the twelfth century onwards brought with them Aristotle's First Mover and the limitation of knowledge to universals, together with interpretations of both positions by Arab philosophers. Aristotle's identification of thought with the object of thought in his *Metaphysics* was particularly influential.

Early medieval theologians can be conveniently divided into two broad traditions on whether ideas were *within* God's mind or *were* God's mind: Augustine followed Plato on ideas being *within* God's mind, while pseudo-Dionysius (and later Anselm) followed Plotinus in holding they *were* God's mind.⁸³ Augustine and Anselm also differed on the question of whether God knew all things separately or had only one single idea, with Augustine favouring God having many ideas while Anselm preferred a single idea. By the thirteenth century, Anselm's view seems to have become dominant. An exception was Richard Rufus (still a secular in the 1230s and probably studying in Paris) in his *De ideis*, which went against the position gradually being developed by Alexander of Hales and other Franciscans.⁸⁴

The progression of thought from Peter Lombard shows this developing line of reasoning. Following Augustine, Peter Lombard had argued that not all things that God knows were in his essence, since this would wrongly equate them with this. Alexander of Hales' thinking developed gradually. In his 1220s *Glossa* he argued that everything in God was his essence and that 'there are many things from eternity', with the explanation that a point terminating many lines remained one point. But, by the time of the question *De scientia divina* (attributed to him and written perhaps as late as 1235), while he argued that the divine ideas were identical to God's essence, to establish their singularity, he argued there was a difference between a multitude of concept ('ratio') and of reality ('res'). Concept in the sense of notion was 'from a multitude in things produced from ideas/conceived as ideas in the mind ('ideatis')'. This does not 'make a multitude in the idea but in the understanding of the idea', and thus 'no multitude in the substance

of an idea but in what is said in relation to it'.⁸⁵ Alexander thus distinguished between many ideas and one idea of many things, using the semantic argument that one utterance did not signify many things – it was denoted more properly as a sign of many signs or an idea of many ideas ('multorum signum sive multarum idea').⁸⁶ This final position represented the position subsequently stipulated in article seven. The difference between his two solutions was small but significant, lying in whether plurality and unity both existed in God (his initial view) or whether plurality only existed in created things within time (his final position).⁸⁷

Richard Rufus took a different, and opposing, view. In his *De ideis*, c.1236, Rufus presented his argument as an attack on Averroes, not Alexander, and targeted his argument against Aristotle's (and Avicenna's) view that God only knew universals:

The first intelligence through its own knowledge is the cause of all causes; therefore also of individuals. Therefore because the true cause is altogether filled before the thing or things caused, individuals were known by the first cause before they existed at all.

Rufus continued:

Averroes ...: those separated intelligences only understand universals in nature. I argue: therefore they do not understand themselves or they are not singular things but universals in nature. But it is highly unlikely that they do not understand themselves since ... their own action is their substance.⁸⁸

It thus appears that both Alexander and Rufus were trying to square God's caring role with Aristotle's views, but Rufus' initial (and, indeed, following a temporary movement towards the view established as orthodox by the condemnation, ultimate) solution involved the existence of multiple entities – known separately by God – before their temporal creation.⁸⁹ Subsequent Franciscans initially followed Alexander but then tended to move closer to Rufus' position, with Odo Rigaud arguing, after 1245, that knowing individuals meant there must be distinct ideas as individuals to be known.⁹⁰ This suggests an intriguing development of thought within the Franciscan order, first complying with, but then, once the dust had settled, sidestepping, the prescription of article seven.

Finally, in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, Albertus Magnus asked whether there was one idea in God or many ('una idea, vel plures'), concluding that the term 'idea' must be considered in three ways. The first was 'according to substance ('id quod est'), and thus it is the divine essence and the divine intellect and is one alone'. The second was in relation to 'the one understanding or operating through an idea ('in comparatione ad intelligentiam per ideam, vel operantem')', and, again, 'this was not many but only one alone, because the one understanding is one indivisible ('unum indivisibile')'. The third was 'in relation to the works themselves of which it is the idea, and thus the idea has plurality which comes from [the things] which result from it'. Albertus stated that 'it is better to refer to

an idea of many things ('multorum idea'), than many ideas ('multae ideae').⁹¹ Thus, by deconstructing the term 'idea', Albertus provided helpful clarity, which brought apparently irreconcilable positions into a coherent theory compatible with article seven, retaining both God's single essence and the apparent multitude of ideas belonging to things.

In conclusion, it is clear that the debate on God's knowledge was long-running, but that the new learning served as a catalyst for concern in the decade immediately preceding the condemnation. Of the two possible approaches, that of Alexander of Hales prevailed, and was reflected in article seven. Indeed, given Alexander's strong views, combined with his involvement in the imposition of the condemnation and the apparent fluidity of the debate on God's knowledge, his personal views may have lain behind the precise phrasing in article seven that there is 'one truth alone, which is God'. The article's emphasis on truth *being* God suggests the complete agenda of how God knows was in the minds of those drafting the article.

Multiplicity of the Trinity

The Trinitarian issue only appeared in Godefroid of Bléneau's quodlibet, where the persons of the Trinity are identified as three truths from eternity (thus representing multiple truths, although all are God). Godefroid's response rejected this because truth belonged to substance.⁹² This issue was thus clearly being discussed in the context of eternal truths in the first half of the thirteenth century, but no other texts on it have emerged in this study. However, the idea that the three persons of the Trinity represented multiple truths could have increased Christian vulnerability to accusations of polytheism from other faiths.⁹³

Conclusion

It is clear that none of the four strands underlying article seven were topics which arose in the thirteenth century simply as a result of the influx of new learning – they had been part of mainstream debate going back at least to Augustine, with discussions continuing throughout the intervening period. Plato's *Timaeus* contained sufficient problematic material on God and truths to ensure the issues were on the Christian agenda from the outset, while Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* guaranteed Plato's views remained firmly on the theological 'syllabus'. The new learning clearly added fuel to the fire, sharpening and refocusing discussion, but it did not create the problem.

The question then arises, which, if any, of the four areas identified was the leading concern? Given William of Auvergne's role in the condemnation, his interest in stateables would probably have ensured this area was taken seriously as one on which the proper doctrine needed to be established beyond doubt. However, the issue *per se*, one of logic and semantics as much as theology, while requiring detailed intellectual analysis, had no new features prioritising its resolution. How God knew and the role of ideas, within or identical with God's essence, was

a more strictly theological question, important to ensure God's simplicity. But its resolution may have been needed more to support the other strands than in its own right, although it was an issue clearly close to Alexander of Hales' heart. The Trinitarian conundrum, which also formed part of the wider debate on the nature and composition of God, while relevant to article seven, did not figure in Alexander's list. However, if linked to accusations of Christian polytheism, it needed rebuttal.

This leaves the first item in Alexander's list, mathematical concepts or ideas (including their possible creative role), as the main contender. This seems likely. The wording of article seven has a Platonic ring to it. Its position, next to article eight on creation (and indeed its inclusion among Alexander's questions focussed on the creation and duration of the world) suggests a linked concern or, at least, an association of thought. Arguments for eternal truths as real things, not as propositions, were seen by, for example, Robert Grosseteste, as more difficult to counter and perhaps more dangerous in their implications. And, finally, the possible extrapolation of ideas to cover angels could have seemed an additional reason to ensure proper doctrine was in place.

Article eight: time and creation

Out of the newly translated Aristotelian and associated texts, those dealing with time and the eternity of the world were the ones thirteenth-century Paris theologians probably found most problematic.⁹⁴ Douai, MS 434, gives a good idea of the range of issues discussed connected with the issues in article eight. It includes twenty-five questions on creation generally, with eight of these having the issues in article eight as their single or main topic. For example, Question 147, attributed to the Oxford theologian (and Paris student pre-1229) William of Durham, asked 'what is eternity?'; 'what is the difference between time and uncreated eternity?'; and 'what is in eternity?'.⁹⁵ Question 460 asked about eternity, including what it is; whether eternity and God are the same; and whether eternity, time and perpetuity ('evum') are the same. Question 461, attributed to Pierre de Bar (probably at Paris until c.1230, created cardinal in 1244), asked whether God was the cause of things from eternity, and whether any other things were created before the world. Question 463 concerned God's omnipotence, including whether he could have made the world not to have existed. Question 533 looked at God creating heaven and earth 'in the beginning', and noted three expositions of this phrase, of which one was that 'in the beginning' meant he created it in the beginning of time. Such questions go to the heart of the issues in article eight.⁹⁶

Article eight focused on two specific issues – the first moment of time ('tempus nunc') and the undergoing of creation ('creatio-passio') – but these were part of a much wider debate which included them directly and indirectly, sometimes separately, sometimes together – if the world was eternal, then neither time nor creation were truly 'created'. This conflation is reflected in the passages cited below. The escalation of concern can be tracked through comparison of Peter Lombard's 1150s *Sententiae* with Alexander of Hales' 1220s

Glossa and later questions, and Albertus Magnus' 1240s commentary. Peter Lombard's discussion of creation came in his second book, but the first also contained crucial passages in the context of God's essence and total difference from any created being, and commentators on the *Sententiae* followed the same arrangement.

Starting with the first moment of time ('tempus nunc'), Peter Lombard discussed things said of God in time and relatively, and the use of the term 'lord', which applied to God's action both inside and outside time. He argued: 'Although he [God] did not begin to be lord of time in time, yet he began to be lord of time, because time did not always exist. And he became lord of man himself in time'.⁹⁷ This implicitly established a first moment of time. The second book then discussed both creation and time. Peter Lombard started with God's role as sole creator, or principle, of things, not, as 'some have held', many principles, noting Plato's belief in three principles, 'God, the archetype, and matter; that these were uncreated, without beginning; and God was merely an artifex [i.e. someone making something from pre-existing material, not from nothing], not a creator'. He discussed the meaning of 'create', which applied to God alone. But he noted that, when God created, 'it cannot properly be called an action, since any action consists of motion, but in God there is no motion ...' (a point potentially relevant to discussions on 'creatio-passio', the logical counterpart to which would be 'creatio-actio'). He also noted Aristotle's position that the world always existed. Otherwise, Peter Lombard appears more concerned over when angels were created. He stated:

... [N]othing was made before heaven and earth, not even time, for these were created with time but not from them ... Not even time was made before the spiritual nature ... and the corporeal one ... For they [angels] were created with time, not from time, or in time, just as time itself was not created in time ...

Peter Lombard noted Jerome's *In Titum* implied time existed before worldly time. According to Peter Lombard, Jerome had said:

Not even six thousand years of our time have passed; but how many eternities ... shall we adjudge to have passed during which the angels ... and the other orders served God without changes and measures of times ...

Peter Lombard commented:

Some who have agreed with these words have said that worldly time began with the world, but that there was an eternal and changeless time before the world.

However, Peter Lombard believed this was to misinterpret Jerome.⁹⁸ Thus, for him, the issues involved making sense of biblical and patristic discussion, which

was often confused or obscure – while he was aware of Plato’s and Aristotle’s views, these were not his main concern.⁹⁹

By contrast, Alexander of Hales’ *Glossa* added arguments drawn from the new Aristotelian material to the debate:

But it is objected that the power of God and his wisdom and will were from eternity, and nothing extrinsic operating will be needed for this, that a thing goes out into actuality/act (‘actum’); therefore things existed from eternity. Moreover, if there is a cause, there is something caused; but there was a cause from eternity; therefore there was something caused from eternity.

Indeed, in commenting on Peter Lombard’s account of Aristotle’s principles, and in trying to demonstrate the compatibility of his claim that the world always existed with Christianity, Alexander specifically cited Aristotle’s *Physics*:

Always...: without beginning and end. Not so, as Aristotle said the opposite, at the end of *Physics* VI [10]. *Always*: any time in time (‘quandocumque tempore’). This is true. Augustine also said this in his *Super Genesim*. And that ‘always’ should be understood from the universality of particular times. In a second mode the soul is said always to be. In a third, God always is. The first always is of time, the second always of perpetuity (‘aevi’), the third always of eternity.¹⁰⁰

However, Alexander relied primarily on the *Glossa ordinaria* and patristic authority in his ensuing discussion, particularly on Augustine’s observation [*De civitate Dei*, xii, 15], that ‘for time, since it runs by change, cannot be coeternal with immutable eternity’. He also quoted Isidore (I *Sent.*, 10) that ‘it must be believed that time was created at the beginning of the world’, but this is said ‘by reason of the very “now” of time’.¹⁰¹

Alexander’s coverage of the issues underlying article eight had progressed further by the 1230s. Questions 6 and 9 of his *Quaestio De duratione mundi* involved theories attributable to Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, *Physics* and *De generatione et corruptione*.¹⁰² On ‘primum nunc’, he explicitly tackled Aristotle’s argument that if time is not perpetual, it began to be; but ‘everything which began to be, began to be in some “now”, therefore time began to be in some “now”’; but ‘that “now” is time, therefore time began to be in time’. Alexander listed five arguments which, he stated, some philosophers advanced on the eternity of the world, all found in Aristotle’s works. They included the argument that, if the world was not eternal, it must have gone from potentiality to actuality, and hence through change – so some change must have preceded it. But that change was itself not eternal, so must have been preceded, etc. Moreover, if the world was capable of generation or corruption, something must have existed before it to be generated or corrupted – so again, there was an infinite regression if there were no eternal prime matter. Likewise, for anything to start to move anything meant it would undergo change. Similar arguments had been put forward by Maimonides, Avicenna and others, as

well as other Latin authors. They dated back at least to the sixth century, but the new translations had revived them.¹⁰³

Alexander's quaestio also expressly covered the issue of 'creatio-passio' – his is the only text using this exact wording this study has found in this period, except for Douai, MS 434, Question 461 (although the concept was implicit in perhaps the majority of discussions on creation, including by Peter Lombard and Albertus Magnus). Alexander's quaestio stated:

The objection: the creation-action [the act of creation] ('creatio-actio') was not throughout all time/always, so it was not from eternity: creation-action is nothing eternal; but God is eternal, therefore God is not creation, but also because creation denotes action ('sonat in actionem'), therefore creation, whereby it is action, is the created universe ('creatura').

Alexander then cited a further argument, this time with explicit reference to 'creatio-passio':

Creation-passion [the undergoing of creation] ('creatio-passio') is the created universe; but creation-action is opposed relatively to creation-passion, and vice versa; if therefore they are opposed relatively, they cannot be in the same thing, and it is plainly the case that creation-action and creation-passion will not be in the same thing; but creation-passion is in the created universe, therefore creation-action is not in the created universe, therefore it is in God; but nothing is in God which is not God, therefore creation-action is God. From this it can be further concluded that it was from eternity; but when there was creation, there were created things, therefore there were created things from eternity, therefore many things are from eternity.¹⁰⁴

Although the terminology was different, the second argument might partly reflect the simultaneity of cause and effect – God's action, the cause, must be eternal, and therefore the created thing, the world, must be eternal. This was Avicenna's argument, with temporal simultaneity for cause and effect but ontological sequencing. Moreover, for creation to take place, something must already exist, or the act of creation could result in a change in the creator. In his response, Alexander noted creation-action meant two things:

one which is eternal, signifying the action of God; and the other temporal, signifying something on the part of the created universe ... in respect of the first, one must allow that it is God himself and that it is from eternity, nor therefore is it [necessary] to posit things being from eternity ... in respect of the second, thus it is not God himself, nor is it from eternity, since things were created in time.¹⁰⁵

By the time Albertus Magnus was writing his commentary on the *Sententiae* in the 1240s, discussion on whether there was any beginning of time had become

even more complex, taking the new texts very seriously. Albertus stated the existence of a beginning to time appeared to contradict some philosophers, citing Aristotle's criticism (*Physics*, VIII) of Plato, that he 'alone gave birth ('genuit') to time, and said that time had begun with heaven'. Albertus noted the claim that, if time began, it began either in itself or in something else, deriding both resultant propositions. He noted arguments by both Aristotle and Avicenna that time either began in the divisible or in the indivisible:

If in the divisible: then since before that there was a divisible part, and not itself, time existed before the beginning of time ... which is false. If it began in the indivisible: then time was divisible in the indivisible which is unintelligible. But if ... the beginning of time was the beginning of the now ('nunc') itself. Against: either it began in itself, or in another. If in another: then it was in another: and this was either of time or of eternity, because perpetuity ('aevum') was not before time. If of time: then time was before the first time. If eternity: then time was in eternity as if [with eternity] measuring its inception: and this is false, because eternity measures nothing variable: therefore it seems that in no way did time begin.

Albertus concluded that the beginning of time was in its own indivisibility, which was the now. He rejected the objection that it was then in the indivisible as not following 'since it is successive', but 'it was continuously after this, and from this it is one: because its continuation began from that'. For 'although time is not in the now, nevertheless it may properly ('bene') be continued to the now, and from the now, as a line from point to point'.¹⁰⁶

Turning to creation and eternity, Albertus' discussion focused on Plato's views and on pantheism as well as on the new Aristotelian material. He first discussed various interpretations of the text 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth' [Gen. i:1]. Of these, the interpretation 'that at the beginning of time he created heaven and earth, i.e. angelic and corporeal nature' provided for 'the beginning of time and temporal things' and excluded 'the eternity of the world ...'. A further interpretation, that 'angels [were] created with bodies' excluded 'the subtle error of the philosophers, which a few hold, namely the eternity of intelligences and their creation of lower beings'. On matter, Albertus argued it was not eternal, despite many philosophers believing this. He commented:

Because there is nothing for him [the first maker] in potentiality, potentiality was not in him; and therefore, so he [Plato] believed, he could not produce from himself that [potentiality], and therefore gave it to himself from eternity; and this reason/principle forced all philosophers to posit matter to be eternal; but this is wrong, since they proceed as if God works through the necessity of nature ... [whereas Christians believe] he works through power, and thus created it [matter] from nothing, and, given this, none of the impossibilities follow that the philosophers fear.¹⁰⁷

Second, Albertus was worried about misinterpretation of the basic tenets of Christianity in a pantheistic way and with significant implications for the eternity of matter. He concluded that both statements – ‘God is in everything from eternity’ and ‘God is everywhere from eternity’ – were false. The first signified ‘the ambit of the divine essence’ and ‘the effect of the conservation in respect of being; but the effect itself was not from eternity, nor was God himself in everything from eternity’. The second should be understood as ‘the effect which is the putting together (‘collatio’) of a place so that it should have the power to contain; but this effect was not from eternity’; so also God was not everywhere from eternity. Albertus noted: ‘God is not said to be in things in the same way that things are in him’.¹⁰⁸ In the context of Plato’s belief that God was merely an ‘artifex’, Albertus referred to David of Dinant:

For the artifex is reduced to the efficient [cause], the exemplar to the formal [cause], and matter is posited in its own name. For it seems that the efficient principle and prime matter are reduced to the same thing. And that is the error of David of Dinant.¹⁰⁹

Albertus asserted that David of Dinant argued that whatever things existed, and were in no way different, were the same: God and prime matter existed and differed in no way; so they were the same. He condemned this as ‘stupid and ridiculous’. It would mean no creation took place. The reference to David of Dinant demonstrates ongoing awareness of David’s views, despite their ban at the 1210 Synod of Sens and in the 1215 university statutes, even in an area where, by the 1240s, the new Aristotelian material might understandably have submerged earlier controversies. It illustrates the perils theologians had identified in Plato’s theories when applying Aristotelian principles to them, such as on causation, and shows that David’s condemnation was still in the mind of at least some theologians in the 1240s.¹¹⁰

However, as with his analysis of the beginning of time, much of Albertus’ focus on creation and eternity was now on the new Aristotelian material. He asked if, as imputed to him, Aristotle had proved the world was eternal. Maimonides had collected together seven of Aristotle’s arguments in his *Guide for the Perplexed*, a text which Albertus used as a ‘short-cut’ for his inquiry. They included one ‘which ... all the ancients agree on’, that ‘the motion of heaven has no beginning’, which only Plato opposed. The ‘ancients’ based this on two propositions: ‘the motion of heaven is a beginning and the cause of all that moves and was made after they were not’; and ‘whatever is the first beginning of every making and of the beginning of everything, is itself neither made nor begins – because otherwise there would be an infinite regression’. Albertus listed other arguments, including from Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Ptolemy, Aristotle, and his Greek and Arab commentators, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius and Averroes, as well from Latin doctors such as Boethius. He concluded:

Without doubt nothing is more probable even according to reason than that the world had a beginning, as Maimonides said and this should be held by

this faith. But it is impossible that it began through motion and generation, or that it should stop through movement to a different form or corruption to a different matter. The arguments of Aristotle prove only this, and hence they conclude nothing against faith.

Albertus argued it was not Aristotle but only his commentators who introduced heresy.¹¹¹

On the role of nature as part of ‘the cause of the creation of the whole universe’s existence’, Albertus stated that ‘both the views of the philosophers and of the doctors of the sacred Scripture should be noted’. He identified four groups of different philosophical opinions before Aristotle, including the Epicureans, Empedocles, Anaxagoras and Plato. Albertus further divided those commenting on Aristotle, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Avicenna, Averroes and others, into two groups who agreed on one point and differed on two:

For Avicenna and almost all the others agree on the following, that what is in potentiality only comes into actuality through what is always in actuality. But Averroes denies this, and some others with him.

Albertus noted the Church Fathers were also divided. A small group held that all forms were created – the act of creation completed all the movement of nature, and nature only made matter by pre-preparation. A larger group held God operated in and with nature. Albertus favoured the second view: it meant that after the six days of creation from nothing, nature took over the work of propagation.¹¹²

The progression of discussion from Peter Lombard to Albertus Magnus thus demonstrates a significant increase both in concern and in the complexity of arguments and the sources used in discussions on whether there was a first moment of time and whether the world was eternal and no ‘creatio-passio’ occurred. In particular, Albertus’ discussion makes clear that, by the 1240s, the views of Aristotle and his commentators were causing major problems, needing full rebuttal, and that both Averroes and Maimonides were in the frame. However, pantheism, including David of Dinant’s views, remained a significant issue.

Three other theologians demonstrate the same progression of thought and the same concerns from the 1220s to the 1240s on the issues underlying article eight. First, in the works of William of Auvergne, with his pivotal role in the condemnation, the errors which William found and rejected in the works of Aristotle, Avicenna and their adherents included two relevant to article eight: that the world did not begin in time; and the First Cause operated through necessity, like a natural cause. William was one of the first Latin theologians to realise Aristotle’s views could not be squared with Christian ones. He therefore examined in depth the theories of eternity and time, including their inter-relationship. In particular, he identified Aristotle’s equation of eternity’s essence with that of time as a major problem for Christian doctrine, since it meant time became a subset of eternity. William explicitly linked Avicenna with Aristotle on the resultant doctrine – that eternity was simply time or duration without beginning or end, and the same

applied to motion. This meant that eternity only differed from time as a whole differed from its part and as a larger from a smaller entity. It also implied that eternity did not pre-exist time – since time formed part of eternity, and every part must be before and a cause of its whole, time must precede eternity.¹¹³

The extent of William's concern over both Aristotle's and Avicenna's views on the eternity of the world can be seen by the lengths he went to in examining the issue, first in *De Trinitate*, c.1220, and then, much more fully, in *De universo*, in the 1230s. In *De Trinitate*, he dealt with the views of unspecified 'Peripatetics' or 'some of the better philosophers'; but in *De universo*, the first eleven chapters of which examined whether the world was temporal or eternal, William discussed Avicenna and Aristotle explicitly, starting by examining eternity itself, including Aristotle's definition and some scriptural problems, although attributing some views drawn from the *Liber de causis* to Aristotle.¹¹⁴

The second theologian who took the 'threat' from Aristotle seriously was Robert Grosseteste. Like William, Grosseteste did not believe Aristotle's position was compatible with Christianity. However, while troubled by Avicenna, Grosseteste focused more on Averroes together with Aristotle, perhaps galvanised by Averroes' clearer Aristotelian commentaries and starker views. Grosseteste wrote two works soon after 1230, one incorporated into his *Hexaameron*, the other, *De finitate motus et temporis*, into his commentary on the *Physics*. In these he discussed the arguments of the saints and analysed arguments from reason.¹¹⁵ These included whether there could be a first or a last instant of time and a beginning of circular movement. Grosseteste argued that Aristotle had really claimed the world was eternal and that for 'certain moderns' not to admit this was heretical. He opposed Aristotle's definition of an instant as the boundary between past and future:

I say that it is false to say that 'every instant is the continuation of the past and the future' ('instans ... omne est continuacio preteriti et futuri'), but there was a first movement and perhaps there will be a last in time, just as there are points at the end of a line, although Aristotle and Averroes and other commentators hold this to be absurd. But ... they do not have a demonstration for it, but only the imagination of the perpetuity and infinity of time makes them posit this falsehood ['falsum'].¹¹⁶

On circular motion, Grosseteste argued that 'what the commentators on Aristotle say, that in circular motion there is no first, so there is no first in time ('non est primum in tempore'), is false'. For 'in circular motion there is a first, just as in other motions'.¹¹⁷

Like William of Auvergne, Grosseteste argued the eternal and the temporal were different in kind. Causality and temporal priority were also different. His *Hexaameron* discussed philosophers who mistakenly believed cause and effect must be co-temporal, perhaps referring to Avicenna's view on the co-existence of the First Cause and its effect, although Grosseteste might also have had others in mind, since he referred to those who believed this using the example (dating back

at least to Augustine and used extensively by subsequent theologians) of a footprint in the dust being simultaneous with the foot causing it. In an important passage, Grosseteste noted such people did not understand the doctrine of the simultaneity of cause and effect only applied if both were of same genus, such as both being in time:

Therefore, if the world was made by him, it has always coexisted with him, and thus the world, like him, is without a beginning. They illustrate this ... by the examples mentioned above about the footprint in the dust, a body and its shadow, light and its brightness. They do not understand that the phrase “the simultaneous coexistence of the full effect with the full cause” implies the same kind of measure: either both must be temporal, or both ... eternal ... [I]f the cause and effect do not share the same kind of measure of being, this rule does not apply to them, namely that if the cause exists, the effect necessarily coexists. Therefore, since God is eternal, and the world and motion and time are temporal, time and eternity are not the same kind of measure ... The eternal God is the cause of the temporal world and time, but he precedes them, not with respect to time, but with respect to simple eternity.¹¹⁸

The third theologian, Richard Rufus, numbered Grosseteste among the sources for his works. For example, his commentary on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* (written in the later 1230s or the 1240s and one of two early works attributed to him discussing the eternity of the world), drew on Grosseteste’s works (and through him Augustine and other Church Fathers), as well as Aristotle *Metaphysics*, *Physics*, *De anima*, *De caelo*, *Posterior Analytics* and *Nicomachean Ethics*; Averroes’ commentary on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, *De anima* and *De caelo*; and Peter Lombard. In addition, Rufus made minor use of pseudo-Augustine’s *De differentia animae et spiritus*, and of the Bible, again very sparsely. Rufus’ *Metaphysics* commentary may not have been known in Paris prior to the condemnation. However, it demonstrates the gradual move away from reliance on Avicenna to Averroes in interpreting Aristotle.¹¹⁹

Rufus’ discussion in his *Metaphysics* commentary included the subjects of creation and divine causality. He covered Aristotle’s proofs for eternal time and motion; whether Aristotle or any other philosopher posited creation and, if so, how; and whether Aristotle’s God in his *Metaphysics* was the universe’s final or efficient cause.¹²⁰ Rufus criticised those giving Aristotle the benefit of the doubt, but argued that Aristotle started from false assumptions. His deductions, while sound, were therefore wrong, which was regrettable but not malicious. Rufus believed ‘creatio’ was a specific, separate, type of a ‘mutatio’, wholly instantaneous and unique. Unlike generation, non-being and being were simultaneous in the order of creation, with no priority or posterity.¹²¹ His arguments on ancient philosophers and their view of creation included, like Grosseteste’s, the footprint in the dust metaphor. Rufus continued:

Likewise, if there were light from all eternity, there would also be [its] resplendence; and yet it would only be the resplendence of light ... these

examples are not rightly applied to the Creator and the creature, because He can make all things [out of nothing]. These examples ... are rightly said of the Father and the Son. For John Chrysostom says that the Father is prior to the Son by reason of causality, not nature.¹²²

Rufus' use of John Chrysostom nicely combined contemporary understanding of causality as found in Avicenna with much earlier authorities and demonstrated continuing reliance on the Greek, not just the Latin, Fathers.

On the further issue of Aristotle's first mover as an efficient or final cause, the fact that Rufus felt he had to deal with it in two questions in his *Metaphysics* commentary shows this had become a very complex issue. Rufus referred frequently to 'quidem', implying he was not alone in struggling with the idea of God as the immediate mover of heaven, finally favouring Averroes' theory of the twofold mover. His reasons included one referred to by both Averroes and Grosseteste: the immediate mover could mediate the First Cause's infinite power to the finite heavens, thus ensuring heavenly motion was within time, not instantaneous. Moreover, Rufus argued the First Cause's action was infinite, but if it were identified with the immediate mover, it would be successive or temporal.¹²³

In conclusion, discussion on a first moment of time had very early roots, perhaps most notably with Augustine, whose own position was at times confusing. His discussion, and those by other early authorities such as Boethius, ensured the creation of time and its relation to eternity were major, and challenging, topics on the Christian agenda in the Latin world well before the new translations arrived. However, it is clear that the precise formulation of 'a first moment of time' ('primum nunc' or 'instans'), article eight's opening clause, originated in Aristotle's *Physics*. This text was not available in Latin until the second half of the twelfth century – although Aristotle's belief that the world was eternal, however interpreted, was already common knowledge, appearing in Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* and subsequent commentaries, albeit often explained away. Much of the specific argumentation by theologians immediately preceding the condemnation appears to derive directly from Aristotle's *Physics*, often cited explicitly in texts from c.1230 onwards and complemented by discussion on Avicenna and Averroes.

As regards 'creatio-passio', its exact origin is unclear, and it appears to have surfaced in two different, albeit related, guises in this period. The first issue was whether God's eternal lordship implied an eternal subject, with variants such as whether there must have been some creature to undergo the creative action. This was a long-running discussion, figuring, for example, in Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* and its commentaries – it did not emerge from the newly translated texts and commentaries. Second, there was Avicenna's argument on the temporal simultaneity of cause and effect, meaning that God's creative act must be contemporaneous with the created world, and hence both must be eternal, though one was before the other in priority. Avicenna's statement could well have been a catalyst: it clearly troubled William of Auvergne and was a pressing issue brought to the forefront of his attention by the new learning. However, while Avicenna's

formulation was new, the concept was not. It dated back in the Latin tradition at least to Augustine, with his example of a footprint in the dust. Patristic and philosophical arguments were juxtaposed by Rufus, and the link was implicit in discussions by other theologians and philosophers.¹²⁴

The picture, on the extent that the new translations acted as triggers for article eight, is therefore complex. The issues were matters of on-going debate; but the new learning almost certainly brought them to a head, or at least crystallised the terms in which they were now formulated. Peter Lombard's discussion showed no particular concern that philosophical views threatened Christian doctrine, whereas Aristotle's views and those of his commentators increasingly became the focal point of discussion in the 1230s and 1240s. Although responses among theologians varied, their concern was clear and they devoted considerable effort to rebutting the implications for Christianity.¹²⁵

Finally, the Cathar belief that 'to create' entailed pre-existing material, not creation from nothing, and that effect was simultaneous with cause, could be in the frame. However, the discussion on 'tempus nunc' seems to stem directly from the new Aristotelian texts, and the Cathars do not appear to figure in the context of 'creatio-passio'. While their views – and their use of Aristotle to support them – may have added to concerns, they therefore seem unlikely to have been a major factor behind the article.

Article nine: grace, gifts and glory

Article nine is textually problematic, with an apparent mismatch between the condemned proposition and truth. It involved both moral questions on good and evil and cosmological issues related to how God created and ordered the world. Discussions at Paris in the second half of the twelfth century and the first half of the thirteenth suggest two main interpretations. One derived from pseudo-Dionysius' angelic hierarchies (adopted by Peter Lombard in his *Sententiae*), while the second came from Latin discussions on the relationship of natural gifts ('naturalia') and those of divine origin ('gratuita'). These were linked by one common issue – whether heavenly rewards were somehow predestined – but the underlying agenda developed largely from different traditions. The first came from late fifth/early sixth-century Greek fascination with angels, both as themselves – including their classification – and as exemplars for humans.¹²⁶ The second originated in Latin concerns over the nature of humanity and original sin – although a link with angels often remained, as in Philip the Chancellor's discussion on grace in angels, which examined the fundamental issues on the relations between nature, grace and merits in the context of angels.¹²⁷

There are arguments in favour of both interpretations of article nine. The first, angels and their hierarchies, figured large in the commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*. Interest in pseudo-Dionysius' writings, in particular his discussion of angels, blossomed in Peter Lombard's time, continuing strongly in the thirteenth century. In the context of the qualities angels had when first made, and whether they were created equal in essence or spiritual substance, in rational

wisdom, and in freewill, Peter Lombard stated that they were created differently. He concluded:

[A]s a result of these differences [in essence, form and power], some were made superior and some inferior to others by the wisdom of God, who confers greater gifts on some and lesser ones on others, so that those who at that time excelled the rest through their natural goods ('naturalia bona') should afterwards be preeminent over them through the gifts of grace.¹²⁸

This links nature and grace in simple terms. It thus fits the offending proposition neatly (although, since the wording clearly implies that both natural gifts and those of grace are dependent on God's preordination, it is not necessarily incompatible with the truth).

As regards the second possible interpretation, the terminology of the truth seems to reflect the more complex underlying agenda on the role of freewill and predestination within the relationship between natural gifts (albeit given by God), grace and glory. But the fit with the proposition is less clear – while these are not necessarily incompatible, the normal counterpart to arguments on predestination is freewill, not natural gifts; and in any case the term 'necessarily' in the proposition appears to rule out freewill from the discussion. However, as Peter Lombard stated in his *Glossa* on the Pauline Epistles [Rom. xi:24], written before his *Sententiae*, 'God is the one who creates and establishes all natures', or again, in his *Sententiae*, 'God placed seminal reasons in all things'. Things 'made according to seminal causes are said to be made naturally'. These therefore lie behind free choices made by humans jointly with God but independently of God's grace.¹²⁹ Such seminal causes complement God's 'primordial causes' placed in a creature whereby his/her free choice is caused by God's grace alone. The concepts of freewill, predestination, grace and natural gifts are therefore connected – better natural gifts given by God (as seminal causes) result in better choices and hence, since God imparted the gifts originally, he gave them to those who were predestined for grace and glory through a predestined proper use of freewill.¹³⁰

As so often, much of the debate originated with Augustine. Augustine's statement (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, vi, 15) that 'if God's gifts are your merited goods, God crowns the merited things not as your merits but his own gifts', gave rise to debate on the nature of merit and whether in itself it resulted solely from grace. This included the question why God created Adam with the propensity to sin, and, if he was potentially perfect, whether he could achieve this by himself. Issues included what 'nature' means, with Philip the Chancellor noting that nature can be understood in many ways ('multipliciter'), including 'a certain possibility ('possibilitas quedam') that God gives to a created being so that it will do his will, and the 'highest law of nature ('summa lex natura')', which is God himself.¹³¹ While the focus from the 1220s tended to shift from a previous emphasis on Adam's creation and fall to current human nature, discussion often remained connected to Adam – if God created Adam as perfect, how could he

have chosen to disobey God? Was God responsible, despite himself being wholly good and omnipotent (an issue related to article ten, Adam's fall)? Some twelfth-century theologians suggested Adam was created with an unrealised potential to be perfect, giving rise to the question whether man could realise this state alone or needed divine grace to exercise his will properly. For example, Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus*, from the 1180s, described nature's plan to redeem her earlier failings by fashioning a perfect man. He would not yield to temptation, but would show that a human could live a perfect life and return to the prelapsarian state. Christ's incarnation and redemptive mission would be redundant. Although such perfection was only possible with divine aid, it would result in its recipient necessarily receiving greater glory as a result of his natural gifts. Alan's poem walked a fine line:

Nature, remembering that her work failed in many respects and wishing to undo her failure ... by a new ... venture, is trying to form a man, ..., give him complete perfection, create him in virtue in order to cast a veil over her long-standing culpability by giving to the wayward world one man from so many thousands who could make good his claim to righteousness, keep his gaze fixed on virtue ...¹³²

This book's analysis of discussion in subsequent commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* has identified no substantive new elements (such as the new Aristotelian and related texts) significantly affecting angelic hierarchies. However, theologians who picked up Augustine's arguments on nature and grace and developed twelfth-century discussions on their relationship faced new difficulties after the advent of the new translations. Using the four causes – material, formal, efficient and final – Aristotle had described nature as 'the immediate material substratum of things which have in themselves a principle of motion or change' (the material cause); as 'the shape or form ... of things which have in themselves the source of motion' (the formal cause); and as 'that from which and towards which generation and corruption tend' (the efficient and final causes). Crucially, a thing's formal cause (which Aristotle considered was most fittingly called its nature) brought its potency into act. Aristotle argued that 'everything that comes to be moves towards a principle, i.e. an end (for that for whose sake a thing is, is its principle and the becoming is for the sake of the end)'; that 'the actuality is the end'; and that 'it is for the sake of this that the potency is acquired' (*Metaphysics*, IX.8). Aristotle's approach thus made nature's actuality the inevitable end for which it had the potentiality, while for Augustine, the outcome for every creature depended on God's will. If translated into theological concepts, this implied a necessary link between the innate gifts of individuals and their final actuality or perfection, with no divine intervention. Thirteenth-century theologians tackling this dilemma included, most notably, Philip the Chancellor, who attempted to combine Augustine's approach with Aristotle's. Philip modified the two positions to create a new type of potency, a 'potency for obedience ('potentia obedientie') towards every divine work' which was 'created from the beginning,

whether nature mediates it as a principle, or whether the will of the Creator does it immediately'. Philip concluded:

[S]ince that possibility arises from a creature's obedience, [since] God can make of it what he wills, and since it is a passive possibility ('passiva'), it does not therefore follow that [the possibility] is a potency for the act ('potentia ... ad actum').¹³³

Philip's discussion thus suggests the newly translated material had added fresh problems to an already difficult area underlying article nine.¹³⁴

There are two other areas which may have some bearing on article nine's inclusion in the condemnation. First, there could have been concerns related to the unacceptable role given by Neoplatonism to angels from a semantic link between angels and predestination. Eriugena noted the Greeks called the primordial causes or exemplars 'predestinations' ('praedestinationes') or 'divine volitions' ('divinae voluntates'), as well as 'ideas'. This could have caused confusion and concern, especially with the equation of such primordial causes with angels. Moreover, while Eriugena's reference to the Greeks could merely have referred to Greek Neoplatonists, he went on to say that he would support his reasons 'by the testimonies of the Holy Fathers', and, in the following passage on a related issue, the primordial causes, referred specifically to Maximus the Confessor, so a link with Greek theology was implied.¹³⁵

Any semantic connection between angels and predestination is, at best, tangential. But it could have been linked to Eriugena's own views on predestination. This was in two respects. Through his translations of pseudo-Dionysius' works, Eriugena was linked with his theories on a hierarchically determined destiny, problematic in this context, and, more generally, any concerns over pseudo-Dionysius' doctrines tended to be attributed to him instead.¹³⁶ Moreover, Eriugena's own position could have exacerbated any concerns. It is unclear whether his work on predestination, *De divina praedestinatione*, in which he argued against predestination although claiming Augustine's support for his view, was available, far less read, in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Paris.¹³⁷ However, it was implicit in his *Periphyseon*. The *Periphyseon* envisaged all things returning to their source, with the Word of God the common end of creation; and, since sin came from will, not nature, and since all shared in the same nature, all would return to God without punishment, although sinners would not share in the same grace.¹³⁸ This emphasis on freewill put the *Periphyseon* on the wrong side of article nine, and, given the conflation of ideas possibly in that article, might have contributed to its inclusion. Honorius Augustodunensis apparently picked up this aspect of the *Periphyseon* in his *Inevitable* (pre-c.1139), and article nine may therefore be added to Eriugena's possible influence on the condemnation, albeit as a secondary strand at most.¹³⁹

Second, and arguably the main reason underlying the article's inclusion, whatever the precise derivation of the offending proposition, there was the article's connection with article ten. This referred to 'Adam in his state of innocence' never having any place to stand, nor the evil angel. Similarly, there was a connection

with article five (the angelic fall). Thus the three articles together covered whether angels and humans were created in grace as well as nature, and, if not, why – the agenda underlying Alan of Lille’s decision to construct the perfect man. The article can thus be seen as playing a role in the creation story directly preceding article ten, where creation entailed sufficient natural gifts and grace to stand fast, but not to progress: it was not greater natural gifts that enabled progression, but standing fast, coupled with the gift of additional grace by God on those on whom he chose to bestow it.¹⁴⁰

However, while its connection with article ten was arguably the main reason for article nine’s inclusion, the wider context is also important. First, even though probably not the immediate concern behind either article, the spectre of dualism would have been present in the background. It is notable that the theory which perhaps most closely reflected the concept of necessity in the condemned proposition comes from the early Christian Gnostic Valentinus, as denounced by Irenaeus in his *Adversus haereses*, written c.180. Irenaeus claimed Valentinus believed that the races of Cain, Abel and Seth represented three different unchangeable natures, with Seth’s descendants (Gnostic Christians, who were essentially spiritual) assured of salvation, while those of Cain (essentially material), doomed to perish. Abel’s descendants (non-Gnostic Christians) had some freedom and could be saved by good works. Irenaeus’ criticisms were adopted and elaborated first by Clement of Alexandria and shortly afterwards by Origen. Titus of Bostris (†378) alleged the Manicheans, with their affinity to Gnosticism, believed that evil, synonymous with matter, and likewise good, synonymous with spirit, were necessities of nature, with sin resulting from the predominance of evil/matter in an individual.¹⁴¹ Both these theories, as reported by their opponents, included the concept of nature necessarily determining someone’s reward in heaven or hell. Humans are by nature either good or bad.

It is not clear how much thirteenth-century theologians would have known of these theories, although Titus’ works were known to Jerome.¹⁴² Moreover, Manichaean texts themselves do little to support the attribution of such beliefs to them. While the view that the body was wholly evil and the spirit good was clearly fundamental to dualism, this did not mean dualists believed someone necessarily possessed a particular nature and could not rectify it, even if this was a Manichaean belief originally – and in any case, the ‘greater natural goods’ in article nine do not fully equate to the predominance of spirit over evil (or matter). Further, while the beliefs thirteenth-century Parisian scholars attributed to a sect are relevant to the condemnation, not their actual beliefs, combatting such a proposition does not appear to have been the focus of any anti-Cathar texts this study has found. Finally, Augustine’s arguments against Manichaeism pre-dated his dispute with Pelagius. He was therefore more concerned to stress human free-will in arguments to counter Manichaeism rather than, as later, God’s predestination, the message in article nine’s truth.¹⁴³ Thus, a mismatch between the focus of the offending proposition (on nature and necessity, not freewill) and the truth (on predestination) is still present. However, dualism could well have heightened concern on the issue of who might be granted salvation.

Second, the ideas of Pelagius were still circulating in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, although mainly in works misattributed to Augustine himself, Jerome or various popes.¹⁴⁴ Origen, while not rejecting predestination, also saw a major role for freewill, coupled with the belief that God's love was so strong as to ensure all rational beings could ultimately be saved; and his views were still frequently discussed – following Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, for example, albeit without naming him, drew from Origen's first homily, '*On Ezekiel*', on the delay between the angelic creation and fall.¹⁴⁵ Pelagius' and Origen's ideas, with their affirmation of freewill, could have attracted many theologians; but, as well as contradicting Augustine, they could also have been viewed as undermining God's omniscience and omnipotence, areas of concern underlying, for example, article six of the condemnation. In this context, it is notable that Greek theological tradition placed less emphasis on predestination and more on freewill. While thirteenth-century Latin authors might not have read the actual Greek texts, the difference in approach could have increased concerns in a climate increasingly hostile to the Greek Church, despite respect for its individual Fathers.¹⁴⁶ But again, while article nine's truth focuses on predestination, its proposition does not promote freewill.

Finally, and unusually, article nine did not specify whether it applied to angels or humans or both. However, each group was tangled up both in discussions of hierarchies (albeit initially focused on angels) and predestination (with the emphasis on humans, but with an angel's reward predetermined by its ordained role). While modern readers might assume that humans were the target, given the period's preoccupation with angels, both in their own right and as ways to understand humans, Paris theologians in the 1230s and 1240s might well have understood the context to have been both angels and humans, with angels first in line.¹⁴⁷

Analysis of contemporary texts provides evidence supporting both of the first two, main, interpretations of article nine's inclusion, and, without further evidence, a definitive conclusion is impossible – indeed its curious nature and the links between the underlying issues may suggest both were in the frame.

As regards the first, Peter Lombard's theory that angelic rewards were necessarily linked to the gifts bestowed on them by God was vehemently disputed, at least in respect of humans if not angels themselves. The stance taken against any link between natural abilities, grace and glory by both Albertus Magnus and Bonaventure suggests that, even in the 1240s, Peter Lombard's view on angels was seen as needing qualification, if not rebuttal, and their remarks imply that his text may have been the article's genesis. Albertus argued, unusually treating angels and humans differently, that, while 'it is not generally true that grace is proportionate to nature', for angels 'the quantity of grace is according to the quantity of natural [gifts], because they were created in grace'.¹⁴⁸ Similarly, Bonaventure's commentary on the *Sententiae*, dating from Paris in the early 1250s, noted:

In human beings, however, even when we can determine certain advantage in matters of nature as well as in those of grace, nevertheless the two often fail to correspond to one another. Where nature is better, grace is often less;

and who today is rightly called the lesser ('minor') might well be the greater tomorrow.

Bonaventure commented further, in a passage implying the existence and articulation of contemporary arguments linking hierarchy in nature and grace:

That argument is not convincing which claims that, if there be no hierarchical order in nature, there could be no hierarchical order in grace. For it is not at all necessary that grace match ('adaequare') nature, nor is it necessary that the order of grace presuppose ('praesupponere') any order in nature, although grace presupposes nature in the sense that an accident presupposes a subject. And because our grace corresponds to the grace of the angels, even though our nature is not of the same species as their nature, thus, if by this [the correspondence in grace] there be in us, too, a distinction of [graced] orders, then this [alone] is to be understood as corresponding to the angelic orders.¹⁴⁹

However, in terms of overall coverage in contemporary texts, and using Douai, MS 434, as a rough measure, from the headline account of the questions, any link between angelic hierarchies and rewards seems largely ignored. In contrast, arguments on the link between human nature and grace, including Adam's state of innocence before he fell, figured in around twenty-seven questions, although most appear only indirectly relevant. These include Questions 90–95. Question 90 is a complicated question concerning the division of good, including natural and moral good. It referred to the six days of creation and Adam's fall and loss of immortality. This set the context for Questions 91–95. Question 91 discussed whether Adam's original immortality was a natural good or one of grace, an issue developed in Questions 92–95. Other relevant questions include Question 423, which looked at Paul's statement (1.Cor. xv:10) that 'by the grace of God I am what I am', with its third part discussing whether grace is something created in us in respect of the thing to be merited or whether uncreated grace is sufficient with natural things. It cites 'Gilbertus', and the entry notes: '*Expl.*: we cannot merit grace ('*gratiam mereri non possemus*')'. Question 434 concerned operating and cooperating grace, with its first part relating to whether we can become good from nature alone. Question 436 looked at the conjunction of freewill and grace. While not all the discussion related to natural good, the connection between natural good and that granted by grace, together with references to Adam's fall, seem to reflect *Anticlaudianus*' theme and the issues underlying article nine, in conjunction with article ten. Overall, it is clear from Douai, MS 434, that the areas covered in article nine of freewill, grace and predestination were seen as important, contentious and troublesome.¹⁵⁰

Conclusion

Analysis of the doctrinal influences behind the formulation of the ten articles demonstrates that these were varied. While they can all be linked, in whole or in

part, to doctrinal developments between 1215 and the 1240s, their origins lay in different sources and periods, largely internal to long-running Latin debates arising from biblical conundrums, but with the impetus for some deriving – to varying degrees – from Greek theology or philosophy, Arab and Jewish philosophy, and heresy. The catalyst for some, such as article eight, was clearly the introduction of new texts that needed rebuttal, although these could also prove helpful, as in countering disparate views on stateables (article seven). Others, such as article seven again, appear to have combined several strands, none of them paramount. Some, such as article four, remain obscure. However, the analysis of article two in particular demonstrates that, while some articles were major current issues in their own right, others may have been more symbiotic with their companions and may have been included as much to complement them as in their own right.

Moreover, as Appendix B demonstrates, the number of ‘errors’ identifiable in the selected works shows clearly that many theologians, and perhaps also arts scholars, were out of step with the developing orthodoxy that the condemnation was trying to establish. The condemnation was far from being issued merely against a couple of minor figures who needed to be pulled into line, or to counter a single unwelcome doctrinal influence. Instead, it embraced the full range of influences. It went to the heart of theological study at the university.

Finally, while the different influences can explain the individual articles, given the variety of sources in both date and derivation, they do not explain the condemnation as a whole. There is no single predominant influence to explain its formulation or why some issues were included and others excluded. To answer these last questions, it is necessary to return to other factors, in particular the institutional developments between 1215 and 1240.

Institutional influences on compilation of articles

Two points emerged strongly from the analysis put forward in Chapter 3: the continuing importance given to Lateran IV’s statement of faith; and the external focus of theologians at Paris, particularly mendicants but also secular masters, including, for example, William of Auvergne, with his emphasis on preaching. This attitude permeated all levels, from the pope as the supreme head of the Church to individual bishops, chancellors and regent masters. Theologians were to be useful: teaching the ignorant; combating heresy in all its forms; debating with Christians who had left the true path; converting other faiths; and promoting church reform. Looked at in this context, the condemnation does not appear simply an attempt to tackle some abstruse doctrinal issues within the university, but rather as a tool for use by its theologians whom Gregory IX, at the time of the 1229–31 dispute, had described as ‘wearing the armour of Christian welfare’.¹⁵¹

The interpretation of the condemnation as an instrument in this external role is supported by what we know of its imposition. Unlike earlier condemnations, it does not appear to have been directed at individuals or their works (although there were many of these, including the only named culprit – Brother Stephanus – and also John Pagus and others). Instead, it was targeted at a collection of doctrines.

Moreover, although the articles focused on specific areas, these may well have been the 'headline' for the additional doctrines which underpinned them. This is at least suggested by Roger Bacon's remark on William of Auvergne's discussion of the agent intellect.¹⁵² It implies that the overall remit of the articles was a clean-up of thinking and the establishment of an emerging orthodoxy for Paris theologians as a whole in the areas it covered – to make the university's teaching generally 'fit-for-purpose'.

Moreover, the timing of the condemnation was not linked to any one specific trigger or development, although there appears to have been a build-up of texts by different theologians which were seen as needing correction. While the process coincided with the Talmud's condemnation, there is no real read-across of issues between the two, with the Talmud mainly offending on Christology, a subject which is striking by its absence from the 1241/4 condemnation. Neither the Greek nor Cathar controversies were new. However, more generally, the late 1230s and early 1240s were a period of uncertainty outside the university and of challenges for it to meet, including the change of pope, the struggle against heresy, and events such as the Mongol invasion of Hungary in 1241. Internally, the period saw increasingly divergent, even perhaps experimental, views at the university, probably especially from the Dominicans (and, to a lesser extent, Franciscans), with their different backgrounds and their answerability to their orders as well as their university roles – this could have been viewed by those involved in issuing the condemnation as potentially bringing Paris theologians into disrepute and, indirectly, jeopardising their external mission. In this wider context, leading figures such as William of Auvergne or Odo of Châteauroux could well have seen the time as ripe for refocusing Paris theologians on their core purpose, adhering to an agreed detailed orthodoxy on key Christian principles.

The institutional evidence thus points to the Paris theology masters having both a need for, and an ambition to, sort out their own house to meet their own – and papal – ambitions, as well as those of the mendicant orders. The question remains why these particular areas were chosen for the condemnation. All seem to have generated views now being seen as erroneous, some much more than others, but they were not alone in this. However, this is where Lateran IV, with its statement of the principles of Catholic doctrine, is significant. The condemnation followed the first part of it closely, covering all its major issues; and, despite variations in order, all the manuscripts show a similar progression of thought.¹⁵³ If Paris theologians wanted to ensure they presented a clear, cogent and theologically correct doctrine to the world, this was the right, indeed the only, template to follow. But it needed fleshing out – the role this study sees for the condemnation.

The institutional evidence from c.1215 to c.1240, coupled with the diverse doctrinal influences behind the different articles, suggests a clear conclusion. The motivation behind the condemnation was not the discovery of some miscellaneous dangerous texts or aberrant trends in thinking. Instead, it represented a more systematic approach aimed at ensuring adherence to the main principles of Catholic doctrine and their detailed interpretation as this gradually emerged through examination by theologians from Paris and elsewhere. It was necessitated

by recent developments, both doctrinal and institutional, and it was designed to cement and provide a detailed articulation of the message of Lateran IV at Paris for outward dissemination.

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 P. Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *RTAM*, 10 (1938), for example QQ.80, 160, 284, 425, 485 (pp. 135, 141, 148, 234, 240). Christ's knowledge was a frequent subject for discussion in the first half of the thirteenth century (W.H. Principe, 'Quaestiones Concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century', *MS*, 50 (1988), p. 1).
- 2 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions'. For example, Q.531 (p. 243) concerns issues around the medium through which humans see God; QQ.9, 20, 256, 441, 454 (pp. 129, 130, 146, 236, 237) discuss the vision of God; and numerous others cover St. Paul's out-of-body experience, prophetic vision, etc.
- 3 Above, pp. 111–2, nn. 149–55.
- 4 Lombard, *Sentences*, iv, 48.1–2, pp. 261–2; Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 3, pp. 37–74; Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 1.15 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 34–7. See also Alexander, *Summa*, i, Q.1.aa.493–4, pp. 695–7, Q.2.a.24, pp. 35–6, for another attempt to square John Damascene with Catholic doctrine.
- 5 For the movement of views away from those of the Greek Fathers (long embedded in Latin theological thinking but also present in the Neoplatonism implicit in new learning), see B.G. Bucur, 'The Theological Reception of Dionysian Apophasism', *Downside Review*, 125 (2007), p. 135. This led Albertus Magnus and others to try to salvage the reputations of the Greek Fathers. Bogdan Bucur argues this shift of views lay behind the 1241/4 condemnation, and it must certainly form part of the picture.
- 6 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII.7 (Barnes, ii), p. 1695, stated that the unmoved mover is without magnitude or parts 'and indivisible (for it produces movement through infinite time, but nothing finite has infinite power ...)'. This may lie behind Guerric of St.-Quentin's limitation of infinity to God's power (below, p. 211). For the development of the concept of infinity in Latin thought, see L. Sweeney, *Divine infinity in Greek and Medieval Thought* (New York, 1992), pp. 320–36.
- 7 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', pp. 237, 239.
- 8 H.-F. Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium de la vision béatifique', *RTAM*, 19 (1952), pp. 94–7.
- 9 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 19, p. 193; Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium', p. 96; B.-G. Guyot and H.-F. Dondaine, 'Guerric de Saint-Quentin et la condamnation de 1241', *RSPT*, 44 (1960), pp. 232–42.
- 10 Alexander, *Summa*, i, Q.1.aa.34–5, pp. 54–8.
- 11 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 4.1 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 102–6, argued, against pseudo-Dionysius' definition of angels receiving the whole beauty of god-like form, that no uncreated intellect could be circumscribed by a created intellect. For Eriugena's discussion, see above, p. 60. See also R.F. McCaslin, 'Divine Infinity in some Texts of Hugh of Saint Cher', *The Modern Schoolman*, 42 (1964), p. 69.
- 12 William of Auvergne, *De universo (Opera omnia)*, i, p. 819, 1A–D. On Plato's world-soul, William (op.cit., p. 801, 2C–D) stated: '[Some] ... believed that a numerically single soul of the world animated whatever is ensouled in the world and the soul of Socrates is not something other than the soul of Plato in essence and in truth ...'. William saw the theory as meriting severe punishment. He appears to attribute the view to Plato and Platonists, not Aristotle and his followers. For the argument that

- William was referring to Christian Platonists, possibly from the school of Chartres, see R.J. Teske, 'William of Auvergne on the Individuation of Human Souls', *Traditio*, 49 (1994), pp. 90–2.
- 13 William of Auvergne, *The Soul*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2000), pp. 250–5; R. de Vaux, *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme Latin* (Paris, 1934), pp. 33–4. William appears to have ignored Aristotle's theory on universals with a single instantiation.
 - 14 For example, Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.16 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 93–5; *In IV Sent.*, 49.5 (Borgnet, xxx), p. 670.
 - 15 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 3.19–22 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 115–23; P.-M. de Contenson, 'La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle', *RSPT*, 46 (1962), p. 440. For William's discussion, see below, p. 212.
 - 16 For what follows and the attributions of theories, see William of Auvergne, *The Trinity, or the First Principles*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1995), pp. 188–219.
 - 17 *Op.cit.*, pp. 188–90. William's reference might be to Ulgerius, bishop of Angers (†1149), thought to have been the contemporary master who, according to Abelard (*Theologia Christiana*, iii, 167–8; iv, 77), believed that 'the properties of the person were things other than God and the persons', and that 'these properties by which the persons differ are things diverse from the divine substance' (cit. Teske's introduction to William of Auvergne, *op.cit.*, p. 36). This is similar to Gilbert of Poitiers' position, but differs in holding the properties were other than God, not merely external.
 - 18 *Op.cit.*, pp. 190, 215–6, 211–2, 218, 191. Roland Teske translates 'adesse' as 'being related to', which makes sense of William's analysis, but 'to be at hand/in attendance' is closer to Gilbert's theory. William himself (pp. 231–5) apparently favoured notions to distinguish the persons.
 - 19 *Op.cit.*, pp. 55–6.
 - 20 Augustine, *De Trinitate [The Trinity]*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 1991), v, 3, pp. 199–200. Augustine's discussion (*op.cit.*, v, 1, p. 192) of the difference between substance and relation in the context of the Father and Son sets out his approach: 'With God ... nothing is said modification-wise, because there is nothing changeable with him. And yet, not everything that is said of him is said substance-wise. Some things are said with reference to something else ('ad aliquid'), like Father with reference to Son ... and this is not said modification-wise, because the one is always the Father and the other is always the Son ... Therefore, although being the Father is different from being the Son, there is no difference in substance, because they are not called these things substance-wise but relationship-wise; and yet this relationship is not a modification, because it is not changeable'.
 - 21 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 26.6–8, pp. 144–6.
 - 22 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, pp. 66, 468.
 - 23 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 12.1 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 334–5.
 - 24 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 4.2, pp. 28–9; Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 4, pp. 75–9; Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 4.8–10 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 168–72. Peter Lombard's dispute with Gilbert of Poitiers in the 1140s would have been well known.
 - 25 Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002), p. 385. This could derive from Joachim of Fiore's arguments against Peter Lombard.
 - 26 However, Avicenna or Maimonides possibly helped to keep the issues in the theological spotlight. According to William of Auvergne (*Trinity*, pp. 181–2): 'whatever is essential is essential to the essential, since whatever is inseparable is inseparable to the inseparable. Thus every relation is necessarily accidental to that which it denominates'. This seems to follow Avicenna's argument that all relations are accidents (Teske, *op.cit.*, introduction, citing Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, pp. 116–23). Conversely, Maimonides (Moses Maimonides, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. M. Friedlaender (New York, 1904), pp. 171–2, 176–7) argued that if any concept could be applied

- appropriately to God, which would be wrong, this would be relation, although not in a literal sense (above, pp. 79–80).
- 27 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 5–34, pp. 30–193. For Peter Lombard's interest in defining the Holy Spirit's position in the Trinity generally, not just in the Greek context, see M.L. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (2 vols., Leiden, 1994), i, p. 252.
 - 28 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, in particular 11, pp. 136–7; Saint John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* (versio Burgundionis), ed. E.M. Buytaert (New York, 1955), ch. 7, p. 26; Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione*, in *The Major Works*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008), pp. 390–425.
 - 29 For its date, see Alexander, *Glossa*, i, pp. 110*–6*.
 - 30 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, pp. 37, 68–78; John Damascene, *De fide*, pp. 26–7; Saint John of Damascus, *Writings*, trans. F.H. Chase, Jr. (Washington, 1958), p. 175. Alexander's arguments in his *Quaestiones* may suggest he held unorthodox views. Moreover, his second discussion specifically on the dual procession (*Quaestiones*, iii, pp. 1386–7, Appendix 1, question five) misquoted John Damascene's *De fide*, implying John favoured the dual procession. A comparison of the texts from *De fide* and question five shows Alexander's use of John Damascene's text was complex – given the mixture of quotations, verbal explanations etc., in both texts, exactly what Alexander attributed to John and what was his own gloss is unclear, but the implication was that John believed the Holy Spirit proceeded from both the Father and Son. However, the text could be a misreporting of the session by a student – the editors include question five among possible *reportationes*, *redactiones* and *abbreviationes*. See also H. Hansen, *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories* (Leuven, 2012), pp. 21–2. For papal hostility, see above, pp. 83–4. However, William of Auvergne's discussion of the dual procession in his 1220s *De Trinitate* was fairly brief, with no reference to the Greeks. Guerric of St.-Quentin's discussion (*Quaestiones*, pp. 236–8), probably from c.1240, similarly did not mention the Greeks.
 - 31 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 11.6 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 345–9. Albertus also noted John Damascene's position that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and rested in the Son, and, like others, tried to make this compatible with Catholicism. His arguments included that Peter Lombard had said in the *Sententiae* that John Damascene's book was Catholic and Pope Eugenius had him copy it out (Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 11.1, pp. 335–8).
 - 32 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 11.6 (Borgnet, xxv), pp. 345–8. For Gregory IX, see above, pp. 83–4.
 - 33 Op.cit., 12.2, pp. 355–7, 15.10, p. 424 (ref.: Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 13, p. 79).
 - 34 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 2.4, p. 11.
 - 35 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 37, pp. 377–87.
 - 36 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 2.8 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 57–8. The downgrading of the Virgin's status is particularly remarkable given her increasingly exalted status from the twelfth century onwards (M. Lamy, *L'immaculée conception* (Paris, 2000), especially pp. 49–52).
 - 37 Albertus Magnus, *De resurrectione*, ed. W. Kübel (Münster, 1958), in *Opera omnia* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxvi, ii, 9.5, p. 288.
 - 38 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 37, pp. 378–9. See also Alexander, *Summa*, ii, Q.1.a.101, pp. 126–7, on angelic incorporeality; ii, Q.1.a.456, pp. 586–8, on the relation between place and its contents; and ii, Q.3.aa.334–5, p. 407, on the soul's place.
 - 39 'Mobile' can mean both moveable and changeable, both appropriate here. This study therefore translates 'mobile' as mobile, to allow for both meanings.
 - 40 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 2.3–5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 50–5.
 - 41 Philip the Chancellor, *Summa de bono*, ed. N. Wicki (2 vols., Bern, 1985), i, pp. 61–4. 'Quantitas' apparently refers to something corporeal, with the connection between quantity and mobility stemming from Aristotle.

- 42 William of Auvergne, *De universo*, p. 630, 1E–H. A fourth use William listed for the empyrean heaven was as ‘the manifestation of glory and of the magnificence of creation’. William believed celestial paradise was both God and the empyrean heaven. His concerns over the empyrean and corporeality may have been exacerbated by his vehement opposition to Muhammad’s promises about the corporeal joys of paradise (W. Black, ‘William of Auvergne and the Dangers of Paradise’, *Traditio*, 68 (2013), pp. 233–58).
- 43 For Concorezzo, see above, p. 90. For Albertus Magnus, see above, p. 36.
- 44 Gueric, *Quaestiones*, pp. 399–404, esp. 401–2.
- 45 Albertus, *In Sent. II.*, 6.6 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 134–5.
- 46 Glorieux, ‘Les 572 questions’, pp. 144, 130, 140, 236, 246.
- 47 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.4, pp. 14–5, citing Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* (*On Genesis*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 2002), xi, 16, 19–20, pp. 440, 442–3). See also Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 3, p. 37, citing Augustine’s discussion on 1.Jn. iii, 3: ‘from the beginning the devil sinned’ (*De civitate Dei* [*City of God*], trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003), xi, 13, p. 445). This frequently used quotation appeared to assert Satan fell immediately.
- 48 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.4, pp. 17–8, citing Origen, *In Ezech.*, *Hom.* i, 3. Peter Lombard’s use of Origen in an area where some of his views (on angelic redemption) were proscribed shows theologians could ‘cherry-pick’ even from his censured views. Peter Lombard’s argument (that angels needed operating and cooperating grace working with their freewill in order to progress beyond their original state to one of virtue, not merely to remain as they were) used the same terms, ‘stare’ and ‘proficere’, that were later used by Alan of Lille (and others) and in article ten itself. Peter Lombard was a pioneer in focusing on the definition of freewill with grace added to the equation (M. Colish, ‘Early Scholastic Angelology’, in Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 85–9).
- 49 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 3, p. 33.
- 50 Op.cit., 2–4, pp. 15–43, especially pp. 19–20, 40–1. For the reference to a medium, see Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6 (Barnes, ii), pp. 1747–8 – not Gregory’s *Moralia* (*Glossa*, note, p. 41). Alexander’s discussion of angelic nature may have targeted Aristotle’s argument on the structure of being (Colish, ‘Early Scholastic Angelology’, pp. 106–7).
- 51 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.14 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 86–8.
- 52 Op.cit., 5.1, pp. 110–1.
- 53 Op.cit., 3.12–18, pp. 82–98. Gueric, *Quaestiones*, pp. 382–3, discussed whether sin corrupted or diminished demonic nature. Gueric was possibly the only theologian before Aquinas to try to explain evil’s effect on angelic nature (J.-P. Torrell, editorial note, op.cit., pp. 68–70).
- 54 William of Auvergne, *Universe of Creatures*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998), pp. 31–60.
- 55 William of Auvergne, *De universo*, pp. 1015–7, 2D–2A. For William’s view on the psychological effect of their fall on demons, see T.B. de Mayo, ‘The Demonology of William of Auvergne’ (University of Arizona, PhD thesis, 2006), pp. 175–6.
- 56 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 3, p. 37, citing Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xi, 13, pp. 444–6.
- 57 Discussion on Adam’s fall seems to have focussed on Adam’s creation in grace, to stand fast but not proceed, together with freewill and whether standing fast was meritorious (Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 24, 1–2, pp. 107–9). Alexander of Hales’ discussion (*Glossa*, ii, 24, pp. 206–13) expanded on this but added little. Albertus Magnus (*In II Sent.*, 24.1–4 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 395–400) illustrated the difficulties faced, noting John Damascene’s view that everything capable of creation was capable of being turned and this must be for the worse – thus without God’s help humans, once created, would be turned to the worse, and could only stand fast if they received some grace (the view Augustine had held). Albertus commented: ‘it seems he could not stand

- fast by himself'. However, the link the dualists were alleged to have made between fallen angels and humans (above, p. 89) could have been part of the context behind article ten.
- 58 For Cathar use of Aristotle's maxim 'The principles of contraries are contraries', see above, pp. 86, 115, n. 181.
 - 59 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, iv, pp. 170–275, sections 814A–860C, especially pp. 206–7, sections 829B–830A; Maimonides, *Guide*, pp. 479–80.
 - 60 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 34.8, 37.1, 37.5–6, pp. 189, 203, 209.
 - 61 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 37, pp. 377, 368–9; Aristotle, *Physics*, VIII.5 (Barnes, i), pp. 427–32. The same argument applied to bodies with bodies.
 - 62 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 37.14, 37.22 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 246–8, 257–60.
 - 63 Ibid, 37.24, pp. 262–6. Rabbi Joanna may refer to Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai (†c.90 CE), Rabbi Eliesur to his pupil Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (†c.120), both leading rabbinic sages.
 - 64 For Gueric, see below, p. 217. J.-P. Torrell, 'Introduction historique et théologique', in Gueric of Saint-Quentin, *Quaestiones*, p. 57, n. 98.
 - 65 Above, pp. 37, 43, n. 18.
 - 66 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', pp. 236, 245–6.
 - 67 Alexander's references included Augustine, *Soliloquies*, ii, and Anselm of Canterbury, *De veritate*, 13 (*Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 240–3).
 - 68 Augustine, *Question 46 (Responses to Miscellaneous Questions)*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008), pp. 59–60. This was the main source for medieval theories on divine ideas, part of a wider controversy over how the relationship between Plato and Aristotle should be understood and framed (V. Boland, *Ideas in God according to Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 21–2, 44–5, 47). For the main discussion on whether the ideas were in God's mind, see below, under God's knowledge – but the issue is also relevant to the nature of the ideas themselves.
 - 69 Albertus, *In II Sent.* 1.3–5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 11–9.
 - 70 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 1.1–3, pp. 3–5, 2.1, pp. 8–9, 7.8, p. 31; Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 1, pp. 1–3, 5–7; 2, p. 16. Passages from the Bible implying the independence of wisdom from, and its co-existence with, God include Job xxviii, 20–3. This asks where wisdom comes from, replying that it 'is hidden from the eyes of all the living', but 'God understands the ways of it and knows the place thereof' (see also Prov. viii–ix, Eccles. xxiv, 1–12). This fits well with Platonic theories (Boland, *Ideas in God*, p. 18). See also below, pp. 244–45.
 - 71 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 1.5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 15–9. In the same passage, Albertus also referred to David of Dinant's pantheism in discussing Platonic exemplars – although the context was the eternity of the world (article eight, below). Plato, *Timaeus*, in *Timaeus and Other Dialogues*, trans. B. Jowett (London, 1970), especially pp. 235–57.
 - 72 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 37.24 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 262–6.
 - 73 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.2–3 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 61–6. On the equation of angels with creators, Albertus (op.cit., 1.7, p. 21) asserted that those philosophers (probably Neoplatonic adherents) did not mean to say 'angels were creators, but rather the illuminators of things under them, and movers in a certain way'.
 - 74 Op.cit., 3.15, pp. 89–92; see also 1.12, p. 34: '[T]hey [Averroes etc.] differ on Avicenna's supposition, that every form was given by an intelligence from which all forms flow, and that [intelligence] was filled with forms, and had influence over nature, since through the movement of the sky and the proximate causes matter was prepared: and it [the intelligence] even had influence over the potential intellect in us ... And he [Avicenna] calls this intelligence the intelligence of the tenth order ...'. Averroes believed that Aristotle thought 'all forms were potentially in matter and drawn out from it through the nearest movers', a view Albertus favoured.

- 75 Philip, *Summa de bono*, i, pp. 54–7; Augustine, *Question 46*, pp. 59–60. Philip also noted that Seneca [*Epist.* lxxv] discussed the genus of form which was a [Platonic] idea, positing five genera of causes – four general with a fifth as the exemplar's cause. Philip's arguments are also relevant to God's knowledge, below.
- 76 William of Auvergne, *The Providence of God*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2007), pp. 112–3.
- 77 For the argument that the *Ars meliduna* was William's source, see N. Lewis, 'William of Auvergne's Account of the Enuntiable', *Vivarium*, 33:2 (1995), p. 134, citing Oxford, MS Digby 174, f. 211ra.
- 78 T.B. Noone, 'An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum super Metaphysicam* book XII, d. 2' (University of Toronto, PhD thesis, 1987), pp. 309–10. Rufus' commentary on Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, i, 36, revisited the issue, c.1250. Given both Grosseteste's and Rufus' association with Paris, their views were probably known there. However, the argument that article seven of the 1241/4 condemnation demonstrates that the concerns were contemporary (Lewis, 'William of Auvergne's Account', pp. 131, 136) is somewhat circular – it pre-supposes the issues in the condemnation were all currently held views. See also N. Lewis, 'The Problem of a Plurality of Eternal Beings in Robert Grosseteste', *MPT*, 7 (1998), pp. 17–38.
- 79 For William's arguments, including that, if 'true stateables were true by the first truth', this must have been 'either formally or effectively', see the introduction to William of Auvergne, *Providence of God*, pp. 23–5.
- 80 William of Auvergne, *Providence of God*, p. 148.
- 81 *Op.cit.*, p. 150.
- 82 *Op.cit.*, p. 146.
- 83 For this division, see Boland, *Ideas in God*, pp. 17–91.
- 84 For this assessment, see R. Wood, 'Distinct Ideas and Perfect Solitude', *Franciscan Studies*, 53 (1993), p. 7.
- 85 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 36.1-5, pp. 197–202; Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 36, 45, pp. 358–9, 453–4; Alexander, *Quaestiones*, iii, p. 1463. See Wood, 'Distinct Ideas', pp. 9–14.
- 86 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, iii, p. 1462.
- 87 Wood, 'Distinct Ideas', p. 12.
- 88 *Op.cit.*, pp. 14–15.
- 89 *Op.cit.*, p. 21. For the permutations in Rufus' thought, see below, pp. 219–20.
- 90 *Op.cit.*, p. 30.
- 91 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 35.9 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 192–5. The solution's semantic aspect resembles Alexander's.
- 92 [Godefroid of Bléneau], 'Quodlibeta Holmensia', ed. F. Stegmüller, *Divus Thomas*, 27 (1949), pp. 211–2.
- 93 Robert Grosseteste could have found the three persons problematic in respect of eternal truths had his overall Trinitarian position not prevented this. He believed that, for things to be established as eternal, they must be real things (which would apply to the persons), not 'stateables'. However, he also believed that, while the Son was a different person ('alius') from the Father, he was not something other ('aliud') – and he argued statements such as 'A is eternal' and 'A is different from God' could be true without implying that numerous eternal beings existed together, because their truths all depended on only one eternal truth, God, existing. Thus, while each person might be a truth, as they were all God, they were not separate eternal truths (Lewis, 'Problem of a Plurality', pp. 26–7). The dialogue recorded in the *Milhamot HaShem* (above, pp. 92–3) may support the view that the issue of multiple eternal truths was used by non-Christians to attack them.
- 94 Roger Bacon, *Compendium studii theologiae*, eds. H. Rashdall and A.G. Little (Aberdeen, 1911), 1.2, p. 33, written c.1292, noted Aristotle's works were banned pre-1237 for reasons including 'eternitatem mundi et temporis' and 'multa erronee translata'. See also Giles of Rome (*Errores philosophorum*, ed. J. Koch, trans. J.O. Riedl

- (Milwaukee, 1944), pp. 1–2), probably written after 1268, who viewed Aristotle's 'erroneous premise' of rejecting any beginning for motion and time as the cause of his many errors. However, both these views may have been influenced by developments after the 1241/4 condemnation.
- 95 For William of Durham and the eternity of the world, see R.C. Dales, *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1990), pp. 51–4.
 - 96 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', pp. 139, 237, 244.
 - 97 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 30.1, pp. 162–3.
 - 98 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 1.1–2.3, pp. 3–10.
 - 99 See, for example, Augustine (*De civitate Dei*, xii, 16, p. 490–2). Augustine asked: 'Does God's eternal sovereignty imply an eternal creation for its exercise'. He noted: '[I]f time has not existed for all time, it would follow that there was a time when there was no time' which 'the most complete fool would not say. ... We can ... say, "There was a time when the world did not exist", if it is true that the world was created not at the beginning of time, but some time after. ... [S]o, since we say that time was created, while it is said to have existed always, because time has existed for all time, the fact that the angels have existed always does not entail they were not created. They are said to have existed always because they have been for all time; and they have existed for all time because without them periods of time could not exist ...'. While this envisaged time as created, it could have been misunderstood. Moreover, in his earlier *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus*, Augustine confessed difficulty over time's creation: '[H]owever this may be – it is, after all, a most abstruse matter, quite impenetrable to human guesswork – this ... has to be accepted in faith, even if it exceeds our habits of thought, that everything created has a beginning and that time itself is something created, and thus time itself also has a beginning, and is not co-eternal with the creator' (Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus* (*On Genesis*), p. 118).
 - 100 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 1, pp. 6, 7–8. The first passage probably also came from Aristotle's *Physics*, II, 3 (*Glossa*, n. 1, p. 6).
 - 101 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 2, pp. 16–8.
 - 102 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 185–96, 201–15.
 - 103 A.L. Ivry, 'The Guide and Maimonides' Philosophical Sources', in K. Seeskin (ed.), *Cambridge Maimonides Companion*, p. 78.
 - 104 The reference to nothing being in God except God may also relate to article seven, demonstrating a further link between the articles. For Douai, Question 461, see above, p. 41. For relational opposition, see above, p. 63.
 - 105 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 201–3.
 - 106 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 30.4 (Borgnet, xxvi), p. 93.
 - 107 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 1.1.5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 6–9, 18. Albertus maintained (*op.cit.* 1.4, pp. 13–5) that 'the great philosophers never thought there was one matter for all things': if Avicenna's *Fons vitae* held this about Plato, it was not authoritative. Plato could be interpreted as arguing both for and against a beginning of the world – indeed Robert Grosseteste (*Hexaëmeron*, eds. R.C. Dales and S. Gieben (London, 1982), pt. i, 11.2, p. 63) commented: 'Plato seems to contradict himself ("sibi ipsi sensisse contraria")'. Whether Plato's ideas were outside or inside time, and whether Plato spoke in terms of time when describing time and heaven as simultaneous (as Aristotle and Augustine thought), or was using an analogy to explain his theory (as Calcidius and Boethius believed), are both unclear (Dales, *Medieval Discussions*, pp. 4–9).
 - 108 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 37.4 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 233–4. See also Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 1.3–5, pp. 11–9. Eriugena and Amaury of Bène could be the target here.
 - 109 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 1.5–6 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 15–20.
 - 110 *Op.cit.*, pp. 16, 18–9. Albertus referred to David of Dinant at least seven times in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, with numerous references elsewhere in his works

- (G. Théry, *Autour du décret de 1210: I, David de Dinant* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 6, Paris, 1925), pp. 127–45).
- 111 Albertus, op.cit., 1.10–11, pp. 24–31.
 - 112 Op.cit., 1.12, pp. 32–5.
 - 113 William of Auvergne, *De universo*, i, pp. 685, 1A–687, 2F (especially p. 685, 2AB), 690, 2G–H. William (p. 683, 1A–B) also credited some ‘Italici’, including one particular ‘Italicus’, with the view that time and eternity were the same in essence, with time part of eternity. The ‘Italicus’ may have been Cicero (R.J. Teske, ‘William of Auvergne on Time and Eternity’, *Traditio*, 55 (2000), pp. 127–8). However, in the same discussion (*De universo*, pp. 685, 2A, 688, 2E–F), William also attributed the view to Aristotle, saying that Aristotle believed that ‘eternity ... is only eternal time, that is, a duration infinite in both directions’. William continued: ‘If time were, as Aristotle thought, that is, without beginning and without end, perpetuity would really be half of time infinite in both directions; this, however, can be called eternity only equivocally’ (cit. Teske, ‘William of Auvergne on Time, p. 128). While William did not identify this, the theories he discussed were held by Averroes as well as Avicenna.
 - 114 See R.J. Teske, ‘William of Auvergne on the Eternity of the World’, in Teske (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228–1249)* (Milwaukee, 2006), pp. 29–52.
 - 115 Arguments against the eternity of the world discussed by Avicenna (and Maimonides) analysed by Grosseteste included infinity. Grosseteste (*Hexaameron*, pt. i, 8.7, p. 62) held that an eternal world would mean an infinity of souls separated from their bodies, or only one soul for all bodies, or that departed souls returned to other bodies or died, all of which were impossible (cit. R.C. Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World’, *Speculum*, 61:3 (1986), pp. 547, 557–8).
 - 116 Robert Grosseteste, *De finitate motus et temporis*, II, 85–6, 90–3 (cit. R.C. Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Treatise *De finitate motus et temporis*’, *Traditio* 19 (1963), p. 261). For *De finitate*’s date and its relationship with Grosseteste’s unfinished *Physics* commentary (to which it was once appended), see Dales, op.cit., pp. 245–66. The work may have been unknown throughout the thirteenth century. Grosseteste identified and tried to refute three Aristotelian arguments for the eternity of the world, all from *Physics*, VIII, 1, pp. 418–21: (i) whether motion was perpetual; (ii) whether motion was generated; (iii) whether an instant was the indivisible dividing-point between past and future – if so, any instant needed time before and after it, so the earth could not begin or end in an instant, so time must be eternal, and also motion, since time was a *passio* of motion (cit. Noone, ‘*Scriptum super Metaphysicam*’, pp. 94–9). The people whom Grosseteste described as ‘certain moderns’ who had claimed Aristotle was compatible with Christianity probably included Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure (with reservations), Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus (Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Place’, pp. 547–50).
 - 117 Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 10, pp. 370–1; VI, 3, pp. 395–6; Dales, ‘Robert Grosseteste’s Place’, pp. 552–3; Dales, ‘Grosseteste’s Treatise’, pp. 261–2.
 - 118 Robert Grosseteste, *Hexaameron*, pt. i, 8.3–6, pp. 59–62. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, x, 31, pp. 419–20, stated: ‘[T]he Platonists have discovered a way of interpreting this statement [*Timaus*, 41B – that the gods had a beginning but no end], by asserting that this refers not to a beginning in time, but to a relation of dependence. “If a foot”, they say, “had been from all eternity planted on dust, the print of it would always be underneath; but for all that no one would doubt that the footprint was made by the pressure of the foot; and yet there would be no temporal priority, although one was made by the other. Similarly”, they say, “the universe and the created gods in it have always existed, while their maker exists; and yet they have been made”’. Rufus and Richard Fishacre both followed Grosseteste’s argument, clarified in *De finitate* (Dales, ‘Grosseteste’s Treatise’, pp. 248–51). For Avicenna, see above, pp. 73–4.

- 119 Noone, 'Scriptum super Metaphysicam', pp. 58–75; R. Wood, 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall on Creation', *MPT*, 2 (1989), pp. 1–30. For Rufus' early views on a first moment of time, and their possible inconsistency with article eight's truth, see below, pp. 221–2. For Rufus' sources, see Wood, *op.cit.*, pp. 16–23; Noone, *op.cit.*, pp. 76–83. While the *Metaphysics* commentary resembled Rufus' earlier commentary on the *Physics*, probably from c.1235, it was often less sympathetic to Aristotle.
- 120 Noone, *op.cit.*, pp. 88–9, 122, 186.
- 121 *Op.cit.*, pp. 123–5, 133.
- 122 *Op.cit.*, pp. 134–5, 209–10.
- 123 In discussing the immediate mover of the heavens, Rufus asked: 'quod ponatur quod si nullus sit angelus, per impossibile in substantia. Numquid caelum possit moveri, et, si non, quare non'. His response appears to envisage the angel as the immediate mover, rather than the soul, as Averroes, to whom Rufus referred, believed (Noone, *op.cit.*, pp. 141–3, 269–71). While not attributing this to Rufus, Albertus Magnus criticised the view that angels were movers of the heavens in his pre-1248 commentary on pseudo-Dionysius' *Celestial Hierarchy*. Albertus' reference may have been to Philip the Chancellor (S. Piron, 'Deplatonising the Celestial Hierarchy', in I. Iribarren and M. Lenz (eds.), *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 19, 32–3). If so, this may suggest that Albertus had not read Rufus' *Metaphysics* commentary. For a comparison of Rufus' treatment of the issue in his *Metaphysics* commentary with that of Grosseteste in *De motu*, see Noone, *op.cit.*, pp. 81–2, 111–7, 141–5. For the dating of Grosseteste's *De motu super caelestium* to just before the 1230s, see J. McEvoy, 'The Chronology of Robert Grosseteste's Writings on Nature and Natural Philosophy', *Speculum*, 58 (1983), pp. 644–6. For Philip the Chancellor, see Philip, *Summa de bono*, i, pp. 47–51; R.C. Dales, 'Early Latin Discussions on the Eternity of the World in the Thirteenth Century', *Traditio*, 43 (1987), pp. 178–9.
- 124 Noone, *op.cit.*, pp. 134–5, 209–10.
- 125 *Op.cit.*, pp. 91–2; Teske, 'William of Auvergne on Time', p. 126.
- 126 On the view that article nine reflects a Neoplatonic hierarchical approach, see, for example, S. Tugwell, *Albert and Thomas* (New York, 1988), pp. 51–2, who argues that it apportions 'divine illumination strictly according to ontological status'. This also provides an implicit connection between articles nine and one.
- 127 Philip the Chancellor, *Summa de bono*, i, pp. 462–87.
- 128 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.2, p. 13; see also *op.cit.*, 9.1–5, pp. 38–41, which was cited by Odo Rigaud in the context of the condemnation referring to article nine (see above, pp. 21–2). The angelic focus of both distinctions supports an angelic interpretation for article nine, although Odo's comment could otherwise equally fit humans.
- 129 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 18.6, pp. 79–80. Peter Lombard adapted primordial and seminal causes from Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, vi, 10, 18, pp. 310–1, 317 (J.W. Wood, 'Recasting Augustine to Look like Aristotle', *Nova et Vetera*, 13 (2015), pp. 817–24). For the views of Peter Lombard's contemporary, the English Paris-educated theologian Robert of Melun (†1167), on God's role in endowing humans with natural gifts combined with freewill, see Colish, *Peter Lombard*, i, pp. 283–4.
- 130 B. Lonergan, 'Grace and Freedom', in F.E. Crowe and R.M. Doran (eds.), *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (19 vols., Toronto, 1988), i, pp. 15–6: '[T]he difficulty was to explain why everything was not grace; after all, what is there that is not a free gift of God? This question more than puzzled Cardinal Laborans [† c.1190] who, defining grace in the strict sense ... affirmed it to include everything man either has at birth or receives after birth. Feeling that this definition did not square with common notions, he next attempted to indicate two narrower senses of the term ... he took grace to mean more specifically everything that the elect have at birth or receive afterwards, and still more specifically the virtues of the elect. This difficulty with the idea of grace naturally involves an even greater difficulty with the distinction between *naturalia* and *gratuita*. The distinction was a commonplace, but what could it mean?

An extreme position was taken by Radulphus Ardens [†c.1200] when he affirmed that before the fall all the virtues were natural but now, because of the fall, they are gratuitous'.

- 131 Philip the Chancellor, *Summa de bono*, i, pp. 468; Wood, 'Recasting Augustine', p. 825. Peter Lombard followed, and elaborated on, Augustine's view that the exercise of good will was the result, not the cause, of grace. However, it could also result naturally from properties God gave to an individual, which developed organically, allowing the individual to share responsibility for his/her good act with God (Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 18.6, pp. 79–80; Wood, *op.cit.*, pp. 817–23). Eriugena (*Periphyseon*, iii, pp. 54–5, section 631D) was the first to distinguish properly between natural and 'supernatural' gifts, defining the first as a 'datio' ("donationes" are ... the distributions by which every nature subsists'), the second as a 'donatio' ("donationes" are the distributions of grace by which every subsisting nature is adorned'). Gilbert of Poitiers and Alan of Lille followed Augustine's view. William of Auvergne and other thirteenth-century theologians developed the notion of condign merit as an obligation imposed on himself by God to reward merit. Other discussions, such as Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, pp. 206–8, focused on whether prelapsarian man was created in nature ('in naturalibus') or in grace ('in gratuitis'). For discussion of the above views and other Latin views on natural gifts and grace in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see A.E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei* (Cambridge, 2005), especially pp. 55–207. On the different twelfth-century approaches to the relationship between grace and freewill, including by Gilbert of Poitiers and his followers (partially underpinned by Aristotle's differentiation between necessity, possibility and contingency in relation to God's fore-knowledge in his *De interpretatione*), see Colish, *Peter Lombard*, i, pp. 268–9; M.-D. Chenu, 'Nature and Man – the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century', in Chenu (ed.), *Nature, Man and Society* (Toronto, 1997), pp. 1–48.
- 132 Alan of Lille, *Anticlaudianus*, trans. J.J. Sheridan (Toronto, 1973), p. 144, lines 202 ff. G.R. Evans, *Alan of Lille* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 146–8, 168–70. For a broad division of scholars at Paris into three groups at the end of the twelfth century, with Alan among the Porretani, see J.W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970), i, p. 43. Porretani views may be reflected in article two (above, pp. 63–5) but not article nine, despite Alan's *Anticlaudianus*. See B. Hamm, *Promissio, pactum, ordinatio* (Tübingen, 1977), pp. 26–40 (for the Porretani), *passim* (for God's freedom and self-binding in medieval doctrines of grace).
- 133 Aristotle, *Physics*, II, 1, pp. 329–30; Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, IX, 8, pp. 1657–60; Philip the Chancellor, *Summa de bono*, i, pp. 481–5, esp. 483. Philip also drew on John Damascene in discussing natural desire and human happiness. Moreover, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, of which Philip was aware, increased the need to differentiate between the frame of mind which determined a person's free choice of an object and the object he or she chose. Aristotle defined happiness as 'an activity of the soul according to perfect excellence', and argued: 'moral excellence comes about as a result of habit ... none of the moral excellences exist in us by nature'; 'excellence ... is in our own power, and so too is vice', or no punishments or rewards would be justified (Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Barnes, ii), I, 13, II, 1, III, 5, pp. 1741–2, 1742–3, 1758–60) – see Wood, 'Recasting Augustine', pp. 826–34. This appears to eliminate any divine role, contravening article nine.
- 134 Other newly translated texts included Plato's discussion on the genesis of virtue in the *Meno* (although this was apparently little read). Plato's conclusion (*Protagoras and Meno*, trans. W.K.C. Guthrie (Harmondsworth, 1970), pp. 156–7) that 'whoever has virtue gets it by divine dispensation', was compatible with article nine. See also J. Marenbon, *Medieval Philosophy: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction* (London, 2006), p. 211.
- 135 Eriugena, *Periphyseon*, ii, pp. 14–5, section 529A–D.

- 136 For example, in his *Expositio in Hierarchiam Coelestem* (PL, CLXXV, cols. 923–1154), Hugh of St. Victor, while using Eriugena's translation, adapted Augustinian terms and concepts and rejected those views he found to be heterodox. Hugh does not name Eriugena but refutations of him are detectable within the work. On the relationship between the Latin Augustinian tradition and pseudo-Dionysius' approach in the Greek, see Chenu, *Nature and Man*, pp. 49, 79–89.
- 137 Only one manuscript of Eriugena's *De praedestinatione* survives (John Scottus Eriugena, *Treatise on Divine Predestination*, trans. M. Brennan (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1998), p. xxv).
- 138 D. Carrabine, *John Scottus Eriugena* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 11, 95–101. Moreover, as part of his argument, Eriugena (*Periphyseon*, v, p. 13, section 868B) argued that nature would not be equally blessed for all, and that being well ('bene') and being blessed ('beate') would be the special property ('proprium et speciale') only to those perfect in action and knowledge ('solis actione et scientia perfectis'). Article nine's offending proposition could be interpreted as reflecting a similar idea.
- 139 Honorius Augustodunensis' theory of predestination (in the earliest recension of the *Inevitable*), was traditionally thought to follow Augustinian lines. However, it appears to have been largely based on Eriugena's works (W.A. Hannan, 'The *Inevitable* of Honorius Augustodunensis' (Boston College, PhD thesis, 2013), abstract, pp. 38–40, 171–92).
- 140 The link between the need for grace for salvation and Adam's fall is particularly clear in Augustine's discussion on the 'magnitude of the first transgression', which made 'liable to eternal punishment all who are outside the Saviour's grace ... There is no escape for anyone from this justly deserved punishment, except by merciful and undeserved grace' (Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xii, 12, pp. 988–9). Moreover, Augustine's belief in the gratuity of grace was reinforced by his battle with Pelagius and his followers. All humans had inherited Adam's sin and were damned without God's unfathomable gift of grace, which he bestowed on one individual while denying it to another (J. Marenbon, *Pagans and Philosophers* (Princeton, 2015), p. 37).
- 141 For Clement's reference to the Valentinian theory that salvation was contingent on nature, see G.P. Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 83–6. Valentinus' ideas may have been misunderstood by his adherents and misrepresented by his critics, with Clement contributing to turning Irenaeus' attack on Valentinus into an anti-heretical commonplace, to which Origen added further arguments.
- 142 Titus was bishop of Bostria. His treatise in Greek was known to Jerome, whose *De viris illustribus* included his short biography (N.A. Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 17–8, 171–6).
- 143 Augustine (*Contra Faustum [Reply to Faustus the Manichaean]*, trans. R. Stothert (Bombay/Mumbai, 2014), ii, 5, xxiv, 1–2, pp. 7, 291–5) asserted that 'by the just law of God, the freewill of man, which chooses good or evil, is under no constraint of necessity'. On Faustus' argument that Paul believed there were two men, one 'the old' or 'outer' or 'earthly man', the other 'the heavenly', 'the inner or new man' (with the outer man doomed unless reborn in faith), Augustine argued that Paul had rather believed that God created one man, but with an inner and outer part. He rejected what he stated the Manichaeans believed, that 'the inner man is not formed or created or originated by God, but is part of His own substance sent against His enemies, and instead of becoming old by sin, is through necessity captured and damaged by the enemy'. While Augustine's arguments do not state the Manichaeans believed nature necessitated a person's ultimate reward, he could be read this way. See Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, pp. 171–6.
- 144 J. Morris, 'Pelagian Literature', *JTS*, 16 (1965), pp. 26–7.
- 145 Above, pp. 144–5. Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 3, p. 39. Peter Abelard, *Sic et Non [Yes and No]*, trans. P. Throop (Charlotte, Vermont, 2007), question 27, pp. 86–7, cites

Origen (*Comm. In Epist. Ad Rom.* vii.8): '[T]he cause of each person's salvation is not placed in God's foreknowledge, but in one's own purpose and acts'. Origen's views are hard to pin down. He argued that God allowed all rational beings to progress by imitating God or to regress through neglect by the exercise of their own freewill. Freewill represents the way by which such rational beings are differentiated. God knows in advance what kind of person each individual will be and bestows his love on this basis. He foreknows every individual's affections and purpose and uses their free action and freewill to achieve his salvific goals (M. Levering, *Predestination: Biblical and Theological Paths* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 38–44).

- 146 For example, John Chrysostom appears to have conceived the relationship between God's will and power on the one hand, and human freedom on the other, as one in which God, through Christ, invites all humans to salvation. Predestination refers to God's original design from before the Fall that all humans should be saved. This represents God's absolute will. However, achieving it is limited by the freedom of choice which God himself gave to all humans so that they could either accept God's gift of salvation and attain eternal blessedness, or reject it, with resultant eternal condemnation. While grace leads the way, it collaborates with freewill – humans start to want and move towards the good, with God then acting in support (J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London, 1958), p. 352; W.R.W Stephens, *Saint John Chrysostom: His Life and Times* (London, 1872), pp. 414–5).
- 147 For angels as a theme underlying the condemnation, see Appendix E). The main reason for arguing article nine's limitation to humans is the apparent acceptability of the link between natural gifts and rewards for angels after the condemnation, as argued by theologians, such as Bonaventure; but this is inconclusive.
- 148 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.10 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 76–7.
- 149 Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, 9.1.9 (*Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72), i), pp. 482–4, (cit. R. Schenk, 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 184–7). Aquinas also discussed the issue, showing it remained unresolved over twenty years after the condemnation mandated the definitive doctrine. Aquinas argued: 'it seems that God destined those angels for greater gifts of grace and fuller beatitude, whom He made of a higher nature'. However, 'diversity of natural gifts is one way in angels, who are themselves different specifically; and in quite another way in men, who differ only numerically' (Aquinas, *Summa*, v, p. 116, 1a.Q.62.a.6).
- 150 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', pp. 136, 234–5; for 'Gilbertus' [of Poitiers], see Douai, MS 434, ii, f. 74v. Lombard (*Sentences*, i, 35–6, 38–41, pp. 193–202, 217–29), followed by Alexander of Hales and Albertus Magnus, discussed God's providence, grace, glory and causation in the context of predestination, but the focus was not the relationship with natural goods.
- 151 *CUP*, i, no. 79, pp. 136–9.
- 152 Above, pp. 20–1.
- 153 Below, pp. 246–7, 249, n. 33.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Manuscript and archival sources

Douai, MS 434.

Oxford, MS Digby 174.

Printed primary sources

- Alan of Lille, *Anticlaudianus, or, the Good and Perfect Man*, trans. J.J. Sheridan (Toronto, 1973).
- Albertus Magnus, *De resurrectione*, ed. W. Kübel (Münster, 1958), in *Opera omnia ... edenda ... curavit Institutum Alberti Magni Coloniense* (40 vols., Münster, 1951), xxvi.
- Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia*, ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–9).
- Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1951–7).
- Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1960).
- Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent*, ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome, 2013).
- Alexander of Hales, *Summa Theologica*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1924–48).
- Anselm of Canterbury, *The Major Works*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008).
- Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), ii, pp. 1552–728.
- Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), ii, pp. 1729–867.
- Aristotle, *Physics*, in *The Complete Works: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes (2 vols., Oxford, 1984), i, pp. 315–446.
- Augustine, *Contra Faustum [Reply to Faustus the Manichaean]*, trans. R. Stothert (Bombay/Mumbai, 2014).
- Augustine, *De civitate Dei [Concerning the City of God against the Pagans]*, trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003).
- Augustine, *On Genesis*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 2002).
- Augustine, *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Miscellany of Eighty-Three Questions; Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician; and, Eight Questions of Dulcitius*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008).
- Augustine, *De Trinitate [The Trinity]*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 1991).
- Bonaventure, *Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72).
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Giles of Rome, *Errores philosophorum*, ed. J. Koch, trans. J.O. Riedl (Milwaukee, 1944).
- [Godefroid of Bléneau], 'Quodlibeta Holmensis', ed. F. Stegmüller, *Divus Thomas*, 27 (1949), pp. 201–22.
- Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002).
- Hugh of St Victor, *Expositio in Hierarchiam Coelestem, Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (221 vols., Paris, 1844–64), clxxv.
- John Scotus Eriugena, *Periphyseon (De divisione naturae)*; Books I–II, ed. I.P. Sheldon-Williams (Dublin, 1968, 1972); Book III, eds. I.P. Sheldon-Williams and L. Bieler (Dublin, 1981); Book IV, ed. E.A. Jeaneau (Dublin, 2009); Book V, ed. E.A. Jeaneau (Turnholt, 2003).
- John Scottus Eriugena, *Treatise on Divine Predestination*, trans. M. Brennan (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1998).
- Moses Maimonides, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. M. Friedlaender (New York, 1904).

- Peter Abelard, *Sic et non [Yes and No]*, trans. P. Throop (Charlotte, Vermont, 2007).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano (4 vols., Toronto, 2007–10).
- Petrus Lombardus (Peter Lombard), *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1971–81).
- Philip the Chancellor, *Summa de bono*, ed. N. Wicki (2 vols., Bern, 1985).
- Plato, *Protagoras and Meno*, trans. W.K.C. Guthrie (Harmondsworth, 1970).
- Plato, *Timaeus and Other Dialogues*, trans. B. Jowett (London, 1970).
- Robert Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron*, eds. R.C. Dales and S. Gieben (London, 1982).
- Roger Bacon, *Compendium studii theologiae*, eds. H. Rashdall and A.G. Little (Aberdeen, 1911).
- Saint John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* (versio Burgundionis), ed. E.M. Buytaert (New York, 1955).
- Saint John of Damascus, *Writings*, trans. F.H. Chase, Jr. (Washington, 1958).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, in *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita*, cura et studio Fratrum Praedicatorum (50 vols., Rome, 1862), iv–xii.
- William of Auvergne, *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Paris, 1674).
- William of Auvergne, *The Providence of God Regarding the Universe*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2007).
- William of Auvergne, *The Soul*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2000).
- William of Auvergne, *The Trinity, or the First Principles*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1995).
- William of Auvergne, *The Universe of Creatures*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998).

Printed secondary works

- Baldwin, J.W., *Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970).
- Black, W., 'William of Auvergne on the Dangers of Paradise: Biblical Exegesis between Natural Philosophy and Anti-Islamic Polemic', *Traditio*, 68 (2013), pp. 233–58. doi:10.1353/trd.2013.0001
- Boland, V., *Ideas in God according to Saint Thomas Aquinas: Sources and Synthesis* (Leiden, 1996).
- Bucur, B.G., 'The Theological Reception of Dionysian Apophatism in the Christian East and West: Thomas Aquinas and Gregory Palamas', *The Downside Review*, 125 (2007), pp. 131–46. doi:10.1177/001258060712543904
- Carrabine, D., *John Scottus Eriugena* (Oxford, 2000).
- Chenu, M.-D., 'Nature and Man – the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century', in Chenu (ed.), *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (Toronto, 1997), pp. 1–48.
- Colish, M.L., 'Early Scholastic Angelology', in Colish (ed.), *Studies in Scholasticism* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 80–109.
- Colish, M.L., *Peter Lombard* (2 vols., Leiden, 1994).
- de Contenson, P.-M., 'La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle. *Le De retributionibus sanctorum* de Guillaume d'Auvergne et la condamnation de 1241', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 46 (1962), pp. 409–44.
- Dales, R.C., 'Early Latin Discussions on the Eternity of the World in the Thirteenth Century', *Traditio*, 43 (1987), pp. 171–97. doi:10.1017/s0362152900012526
- Dales, R.C., *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden, 1990).
- Dales, R.C., 'Robert Grosseteste's Place in Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World', *Speculum*, 61:3 (1986), pp. 544–63. doi:10.2307/2851595

- Dales, R.C., 'Robert Grosseteste's Treatise *De finitate motus et temporis*', *Traditio*, 19 (1963), pp. 245–66. doi:10.1017/s0362152900010400
- Dondaine, H.-F., 'L'objet et le medium de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIII^e siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 19 (1952), pp. 60–130.
- Evans, G.R., *Alan of Lille: The Frontiers of Theology in the Later Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Glorieux, P., 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–52, 225–67.
- Guyot, B.-G., and Dondaine, H.-F., 'Guerric de Saint-Quentin et la condamnation de 1241', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 44 (1960), pp. 225–42.
- Hamm, B., *Promissio, pactum, ordinatio: Freiheit und Selbstbindung Gottes in der scholastischen Gnadenlehre* (Tübingen, 1977).
- Hansen, H., *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories: A Study and Edition of the Rationes Super Praedicamenta Aristotelis* (Leuven, 2012).
- Ivry, A.L., 'The Guide and Maimonides' Philosophical Sources', in K. Seeskin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 58–81.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrines* (London, 1958).
- Lamy, M., *L'immaculée conception: étapes et enjeux d'une controverse au moyen-âge (XIIe-XVe siècles)* (Paris, 2000).
- Levering, M., *Predestination: Biblical and Theological Paths* (Oxford, 2011).
- Lewis, N., 'The Problem of a Plurality of Eternal Beings in Robert Grosseteste', *Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, 7 (1998), pp. 17–38. doi:10.1017/s1057060898071023
- Lewis, N., 'William of Auvergne's Account of the Enuntiable: Its Relations to Nominalism and the Doctrine of the Eternal Truths', *Vivarium*, 33:2 (1995), pp. 113–36. doi:10.1163/1568534952579687
- Lonergan, B., 'Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas', in F.E. Crowe and R.M. Doran (eds.), *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (19 vols., Toronto, 1988), i.
- Luttkhuizen, G.P., *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (Leiden, 2006).
- Marenbon, J., *Medieval Philosophy: An Historical and Philosophical Introduction* (London, 2006).
- Marenbon, J., *Pagans and Philosophers* (Princeton, 2015).
- McCaslin, R.F., 'Divine Infinity in some Texts of Hugh of Saint Cher', *The Modern Schoolman*, 42 (1964), pp. 47–69. doi:10.5840/schoolman19644214
- McEvoy, J., 'The Chronology of Robert Grosseteste's Writings on Nature and Natural Philosophy', *Speculum*, 58:3 (1983), pp. 614–55. doi:10.2307/2848962
- McGrath, A.E., *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Morris, J., 'Pelagian Literature', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 16:1 (1965), pp. 26–60. doi:10.1093/jts/xvi.1.26
- Pedersen, N.A., *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God: A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos: The Work's Sources, Aims, and Relation to Contemporary Theology* (Leiden, 2004).
- Piron, S., 'Deplatonising the Celestial Hierarchy: Peter John Olivi's Interpretation of the Pseudo-Dionysius', in I. Iribarren and M. Lenz (eds.), *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry: Their Function and Significance* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 29–44.
- Principe, W.H., 'Quaestiones Concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century: V. Quaestiones from Douai MS. 434: Christ's Knowledge', *Mediaeval Studies*, 50 (1988), pp. 1–45.

- Schenk, R., 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*: Thomism and Ecumenical Learning', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Anti-Christ or Wisdom of God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 172–91.
- Stephens, W.R.W., *Saint John Chrysostom: His Life and Times: A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century* (London, 1872).
- Sweeney, L., *Divine Infinity in Greek and Medieval Thought* (New York, 1992).
- Teske, R.J., 'William of Auvergne on the Eternity of the World', in Teske (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228–1249)* (Milwaukee, 2006), pp. 29–52.
- Teske, R.J., 'William of Auvergne on the Individuation of Human Souls', *Traditio*, 49 (1994), pp. 77–93. doi:10.1017/s0362152900013003
- Teske, R.J., 'William of Auvergne on Time and Eternity', *Traditio*, 55 (2000), pp. 125–41. doi:10.1017/s0362152900000052
- Théry, G., *Autour du décret de 1210: I, David de Dinant: étude sur son panthéisme matérialiste* (Bibliothèque Thomiste, 6, Paris, 1925).
- Tugwell, S., *Albert and Thomas* (New York, 1988).
- de Vaux, R., *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme Latin aux confins des XIIe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1934).
- Wood, J.W., 'Recasting Augustine to Look like Aristotle: Philip the Chancellor, Natural Desire, and the Advent of *potentia obedientiae*', *Nova et Vetera*, 13:3 (2015), pp. 815–36.
- Wood, R., 'Distinct Ideas and Perfect Solitude: Alexander of Hales, Richard Rufus, and Odo Rigaldus', *Franciscan Studies*, 53 (1993), pp. 7–31. doi:10.1353/frc.1993.0000
- Wood, R., 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall on Creation: The Reception of Aristotelian Physics in the West', *Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, 2 (1992), pp. 1–30. doi:10.5840/medievalpt199224

Unpublished theses

- Hannan, W.A., 'The *Inevitable* of Honorius Augustodunensis: A Study in the Textures of Early Twelfth-Century Augustinianisms' (Boston College, PhD thesis, 2013).
- de Mayo, T.B., 'The Demonology of William of Auvergne' (University of Arizona, PhD thesis, 2006).
- Noone, T.B., 'An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum Super Metaphysicam* book XII, d. 2: A Work Attributed to Richard Rufus of Cornwall' (University of Toronto, PhD thesis, 1987).

Conclusion

If you are confident that you yourself are a guide of the blind, a light for those who are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of infants, you therefore who teaches another teaches not yourself.¹

The condemnation at Paris in 1241/4 was, in its own right, a notable event, or pair of events. It was seen as such both by contemporary theologians and those in the decades following it. But it has been eclipsed by its more famous successors, and largely ignored by modern scholars. By examining the background to each of the ten articles contained in the condemnation – why they caused concern in the 1240s in Paris and why the specific ten articles were chosen – a picture emerges of the evolution and development of the university between its first statutes and Lateran IV in 1215, and the end of Gregory IX's papacy in 1241 and the beginning of Innocent IV's in 1243. Read in this context, the condemnation throws light on the often-neglected years between the university's struggle for its autonomy from civic and episcopal authorities, culminating in the university strike of 1229–31, and the stormy and divisive period it faced from the 1250s, with the disputes between seculars and mendicants and within the mendicant orders themselves.²

While the 1230s and 1240s did not see major disputes involving the masters and the university, this was a period not of stagnation, but of fast-moving events, major intellectual advances and institutional development.

Institutionally, the period saw the structure of a 'university' emerge stronger from the 1229–31 strike. It witnessed the continuing rise of the mendicant orders and their deeper penetration of the university. Externally, Muslim presence in the Holy Land remained unfinished business, despite the truce negotiated by the emperor, Frederick II, in 1228–9, with the loss of Jerusalem in 1244 imminent and Louis IX's disastrous foray in the seventh crusade, 1248, yet to come.³ There was also a growing threat from the Mongols in the east, peaking in their invasion of Hungary in April 1241 but already heralded in 1237, and with the threat of further advances. The long and increasingly apocalyptic struggle with Frederick II, excommunicated for the second time in 1239, was reaching its climax, culminating in Gregory IX's abortive summons of a papal council in 1240 to deal with Frederick, Gregory's death in 1241, and the resultant two-year papal hiatus. Theologians, including many from the university, were involved in the continuing,

even escalating, disputes with the Greeks and the Jews, as well as the increasingly bitter struggle against heresy, with the Albigensian Crusade concluded by 1229 but the conflict yet to culminate in the siege of Montségur, 1244, and problems continuing in Germany and Bosnia. These events were frequently viewed in an apocalyptic light, with groups outside the Catholic faith increasingly seen as precursors to the coming of the Antichrist and the Day of Judgment.

Set against these overlapping currents was the dissemination of new texts and new ideas. Philosophers, but also theologians, had access to previously unknown and exciting Greek philosophical texts and Arab and Jewish commentaries on them – while the theories these contained could be largely discounted as non-Christian, they opened up new concepts and lines of argument that could not be ignored.

It is in this historical, institutional and intellectual context that the condemnation must be viewed, as an event in its own right, a product of its own time. It was not merely one of a series of corrective measures culminating in the 1270s, to be viewed, doctrinally and institutionally, with retrospective eyes.

This study follows the majority view of recent scholarship that the condemnation was imposed, or at any rate the list of errors was produced and circulated, twice, in 1241 and 1244. This raises the issue of what, if anything, the critical three years between might explain about its second imposition. These years saw a papal 'sede vacante' after the early death of Gregory IX's successor in 1241. Perhaps more significantly, they saw increased inflexibility over doctrines considered threatening, as the Talmud examination and condemnation demonstrates, and also unabated concern over Catharism and other heresies. The year 1243 saw the Dominican General Chapter explicitly restricting friars to those philosophical books prescribed in their constitutions, together with the requirement to erase any of the errors condemned in Paris from their writings, while their 1244 Acts required them to forsake novel views ('*novas opiniones non inveniant*') and follow only approved ones – these measures suggest a tightening of doctrine within the Order, perhaps inspired by their new Master General, John of Wildeshausen, with his militant stance against heresy.⁴

Doctrinally, the period and the condemnation may represent a closing down of what appears to have been a more permissive era of debate within the university – not freedom of views, but of a certain licence in more fluid areas of theology. Guerric of St.-Quentin stated, in a quodlibet on virginity, that 'there are many opinions on this, and because nothing had been determined by the saints on it, different views are permitted ('*licet diversimodo opinari*').⁵ This may suggest a more open attitude, among some contemporary theologians anyway, than is reflected in the condemnation, which dictated doctrine on areas some of which were already well established in Catholic theology (such as the *filioque*), but others of which (such as the beatific vision) were not. The difference may lie not so much in a change in practice – some licence was permitted in discussion and this did not change, and, where a matter was seen as critical to faith, any conclusion had to be doctrinally correct. But the latitude given to the exact content of conclusions being drawn by theologians appears to have been shrinking, or perhaps

subject to more rigorous scrutiny, as theologians, in Paris and probably elsewhere, began to flesh out the principles enshrined in Lateran IV and elaborate the details of what must be believed. Moreover, areas perhaps previously on the fringe of the principles of, or critical to, faith could be drawn into the net. Thus, on article five of the condemnation, while Peter Lombard had argued that there was a brief period between Satan's creation and his fall, Alexander of Hales and others appear to have been free to conclude the opposite, that Satan fell immediately on creation. This view needed subsequent correction, after and presumably as a result of the condemnation.⁶ It had now become an area where doctrine was laid down and no deviation permitted.

At first sight, the condemnation may appear as a miscellany of unconnected propositions. As had been the case in the twelfth century, theologians in the first half of the thirteenth needed to develop their arguments and conclusions against an increasingly complex mix of views from influences including Greek theology, Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism, not merely seemingly contradictory or obscure biblical and patristic texts. This led to, or was seen as risking, the development of views which were, or came to be, seen as aberrant, in the light of a developing orthodoxy. Given the number of such views, especially on issues such as the beatific vision (article one), it is perhaps unsurprising that the Paris theology faculty – or the bishop or the chancellor, or the Dominican Order – saw the need for action and collectively put on record a list of errors and their correction.

But this is not the end of the story. It ignores two crucial elements. First, the challenges Paris theologians faced between 1215 and 1240 – from intractable theological issues, sometimes exacerbated by the new learning – should be seen in the context of the development of their faculty's external focus. This changed its nature fundamentally – it gave theologians a purpose and mission beyond academic disputation. It should make us look at the condemnation in terms of the way doctrinal challenges were tackled as part of a developing institutional context. Indeed, it could be said that the theologians at Paris saw the condemnation as an implicit claim to teaching authority (*magisterium*). The theologians had assumed the administrative authority to manage not only their own affairs, but also doctrinal authority, albeit still under the aegis of the bishop: the condemnation states 'reprobamus ...' and 'excommunicamus' ('we reprove ...' and 'we excommunicate...'). The use of the plural is presumably intended to associate the theologians and their faculty in the authority for the condemnation.

The development of the external focus of Paris theologians in the first part of the thirteenth century is well established. It formed part of the evolution of the faculty from its roots in the twelfth-century schools into the major place for theological education and learning in the thirteenth century, imbued with the reform principles of Peter the Chanter (and his pupils) and ingrained in the university's first, 1215, statutes. This external perspective was further strengthened by the inclusion of the mendicant orders among the faculty's members from around the 1220s. Paris theologians responded to outside events – to the spread of heresy, the dispute with the Greek Church, and problems with the Jews and other faiths – indeed, as perhaps with heresy, they may have contributed to the very

problems they were involved in trying to solve. Successive popes, from Innocent III onwards, saw a clear role for Paris theologians – which, as members of the church and relying on papal support, the theologians themselves both needed and wanted to fulfil. Thus, the theology masters came to see their role, not just as leaders and teachers of theological doctrine, but, equally if not more important, as preachers, as advocates for the Catholic faith and the church, and as soldiers against heresy, who could not help but be involved in affairs well beyond the confines of the university.

Second, the condemnation's articles closely reflect the first part of the statement of faith in Lateran IV – on God, the Trinity, creation and man's fall – a statement that served as a 'creed' for the whole Latin Church. This cannot have been by chance.⁷ It strongly implies that the condemnation was an attempt to affirm and flesh out these doctrinal tenets, refocused where necessary on those new or reformulated challenges to doctrine which had emerged since 1215. Moreover, the truths in the 1241/4 condemnation are prefaced by the word 'credimus' (we believe). This may be unique among Paris condemnations, which usually simply state the error or heresy to be condemned and must be recanted, if the culprit is known. It implies the status of a creed. Similar wording is found in canon one of Lateran IV.

The linkage between the 1241/4 condemnation and Lateran IV's statement of faith can be seen at a formal and at a substantive level. There is no explicit reference to Lateran IV in the condemnation.⁸ However, the resemblance between the two texts is striking, with the principles of Lateran IV articulated in more detailed exposition in the condemnation. This can be traced in the key similarities, visible in almost all its ten articles. It can also be demonstrated by analysing the recurrent theme of angels and their role in creation, a theme present in both the statement of faith and the condemnation. Analysis of this particular theme in the condemnation also points up the eclectic mixture of influences behind the various articles, supporting the argument that no single concern, whether differing scriptural interpretation, patristic inconsistency, Greek theology, Neoplatonic or Aristotelian learning or heretical doctrine, dominated their choice. An alternative explanation is required and, in formal terms, Lateran IV provides it. Appendix E contains a case study on the theme of angels in both texts.

This complex relationship between the two texts is visible perhaps most clearly in a comparison of Lateran IV's statement that God created all things from nothing at the beginning of time ('ab initio temporis') with the wording of article eight on a first moment of time ('primum nunc'). A statement of faith issued in 1215 could not have been influenced by detailed discussions on Aristotle's *Physics*, which only started properly in the late 1220s, and gained momentum in the 1230s. Nevertheless, concern over the newly translated works of Aristotle and the commentators on him was already present in 1215, with the first prohibitions on reading such works in force and more to come. So the fact that they potentially increased the risk of heretical theories on the eternity of the world (itself a long-standing area of theological and philosophical debate) had already been identified; indeed this might have been part of the reason for the inclusion of

the passage in Lateran IV in the first place. Thus, the condemnation reflected the statement of faith in Lateran IV; but the presence of the subject-matter of article eight in each of them was due both to long-running concerns and to the new learning, as yet undigested in 1215 but increasingly appreciated as a significant threat in respect of specific points in the two decades preceding the condemnation. This lies behind the precise terminology used in article eight to flesh out the principle stated in Lateran IV and its targeting. It could also explain the specific inclusion of some articles in the condemnation, such as article four on the empyrean heaven. This implicitly fell within the scope of Lateran IV but was not explicitly articulated there. The more detailed reading of the new texts between 1215 and 1241/4 could have rendered issues such as corporeality, motion and change much more problematic and therefore in much greater need of clarification.⁹

The statement of faith in Lateran IV, in setting out the principles of Catholic faith, was still very much the main point of reference for theological authority. This is clearly demonstrated by its placement by Raymond of Peñafort at the beginning of Gregory IX's 1234 decretals, copies of which were widely circulated across the Latin world.¹⁰ It was undoubtedly the proper instrument for Paris theologians and their bishop to appeal to, and deploy, to fulfil their role. But it needed internal reinforcement within the faculty on both doctrinal principles and detailed, abstruse points, given that some theologians, including leading figures, were evidently attracted to theories that potentially could produce dangerous results.

This leaves the question of why the whole statement of faith from Lateran IV was not covered in the condemnation, but only around the first fifteen lines out of about fifty. The subsequent sections, on Christology and issues relating to the church and its sacraments, were ignored, although both were clearly major areas of debate within the theology faculty and beyond.¹¹ Two possible answers suggest themselves, although both are purely speculative. First, many of the most pressing doctrinal issues in the 1230s and early 1240s – in particular those arising from dualism or present in Greek theology – fell into the first part of the statement, which could have given the first fifteen lines priority in any commission of inquiry. Second, the condemnation could have been the first in an intended series of such corrective and declarative measures, a programme subsequently overtaken by other events in the 1240s – such as the need to concentrate on the Talmud (where the trial and subsequent examination may itself have been seen as settling some Christological issues), or the increasing divisions between mendicants and seculars, or the change of personnel involved (with the new pope established, Odo of Châteauroux no longer chancellor, and major figures, including Alexander of Hales, now dead).

In conclusion, the institutional context together with the clear link with Lateran IV suggest that the condemnation's obvious and ostensible corrective purpose was only part of its overarching aim. Paris theologians were ambitious to cement their leading position within the church, both as doctrinal experts and as champions of its message to those outside the university, be they Christian, pagan or heretical. For this, they had to ensure their own collective adherence to fundamental Catholic principles and their proper interpretation.¹² The condemnation

was an essential instrument to achieve this, not just a means to correct sometimes abstruse errors or positions which had become unacceptable in the emerging Catholic orthodoxy. Its production and formulation accordingly throw light on the masters of theology, their perception of their role as a faculty and as theologians within it, at a critical point in their institutional maturation. While we do not know the exact nature of the process, it is clear the condemnation involved the theology masters acting collectively and, it appears, reaching collective agreement – as, indeed, they did in the later 1248 Talmud condemnation, where the list of names signing up to the second prohibition of the Talmud included seculars, Dominicans and Franciscans united in a single cause. This in itself represents a notable step.

The 1240s were, despite manifold external troubles, in many ways a positive time for the university, a period of relative calm and fragile unity – at least when compared with the 1220s and the 1250s. Although composed of different groups with different aims and missions, at this point the masters can be seen as working broadly together and with a common end. The condemnation reveals an apparently eclectic mixture of propositions, perhaps reflecting the particular interests and concerns of individuals within the assembled committee, but which, taken as a whole, were designed to reinforce the agenda of Lateran IV and secure the public position of the university's theology masters. The theology faculty was still feeling its way, but the condemnation represents a defining moment in its development. In 1229 Gregory IX had described the '*studium ... litterarum*' at Paris as one 'by which, next after the grace of the Holy Spirit, the paradise of the general Church is watered and nourished'.¹³ The condemnation demonstrates the Paris theology faculty's growing self-confidence and its determination to fulfil this role. In biblical terms, before tackling the 'mote' in its brother's eye, it had to see clearly to remove the 'beam' from its own.¹⁴

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 Rom. ii:19–21, as cited by Hugh of St.-Cher in commenting on Mt. vii:3–5 (Hugh of St.-Cher, *In evangelia secundum Matthaeum* (*Opera omnia in universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum: tomi octo* (8 vols., Venice, 1703), vi, p. 27q)).
- 2 The different climate of the 1230s/40s is shown, for example, by the fact that the Dominican Guerric of St.-Quentin appears to have been friends with several Franciscans (F.M. Henquinet, 'Les écrits de Frère Guerric de Saint-Quentin, O.P.', *RTAM*, 6 (1934), pp. 187–8). See also F.M. Henquinet, 'Notes additionelles', *RTAM*, 8 (1936), pp. 369–88.
- 3 Louis' decision in 1244 to go on crusade was apparently itself a concern in Paris – for example, William of Auvergne opposed it (Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83), iv, pp. 397–8).
- 4 *ACG*, i, pp. 26–7, 29. John of Wildeshausen had a long history of anti-heretical action, including in the 1230s against the German Stedinger with their non-conformist beliefs, and as bishop of Bosnia in 1233–7, where he was appointed by Gregory IX to eliminate heresy, following the dismissal of his predecessor – see C.J. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 12–3, 58–9. Given the dates, the clear support of the Dominican Order for the condemnation, and his own anti-heretical views, it is

not impossible that John could himself even have inspired the condemnation's second issue, although this can only be speculation.

- 5 Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002), p. 266, col. 2. See also op.cit., p. 269, col. 2, on purgatory. As Guerric ceased teaching in 1242, these texts probably pre-dated the condemnation's first imposition and certainly pre-dated its second. However, any such trend against fluidity should be seen in the context of the dialectic and continuously re-interpretative nature of theological discussion in this period – see K. Ghosh, *The Wycliffe Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 1–21.
- 6 See below, pp. 215–6.
- 7 The evidence for such correlation (and the condemnation's chronological – or hexaemeral – theme) renders untenable that the articles were chosen randomly. Moreover, while it could perhaps be argued that both Lateran IV and the condemnation followed similar logic in their chronological approach, with their correlation thus coincidental, this ignores Lateran IV's undoubted importance and its continuing use – an unconnected use of the same theme in a public articulation of fundamental requirements of faith is unconvincing.
- 8 The lack of such a reference is not surprising in a document such as the condemnation. Moreover, Paris theologians might well not wish any implication that the faculty needed reiteration of Lateran IV's principles or their exposition.
- 9 Similarly, the main issue on the beatific vision had changed between 1215 and 1241/4.
- 10 For Lateran IV's wide dissemination by those attending the council, and the widespread reiteration of its measures, see A. Duggan, 'Conciliar Law, 1123–1215', in W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (eds.), *History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1244* (Washington, 2008), pp. 354–66.
- 11 Of the 572 questions in Douai, MS 434, the largest group (around 100) covered the church, its laws, sacraments and institutions. Over 20 related to Christology (part of a larger group of over 90 on God and the Trinity, which may contain more sub-questions specifically on Christ).
- 12 Belief that internal sins and errors needed eradication for external endeavours to succeed is well attested in crusade preaching, where failures, from the second crusade onwards, were attributed to Christian sinfulness (P.J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991), pp. 41, 54–7, 63, 151–5).
- 13 *CUP*, i, no. 71, p. 128.
- 14 Matt. vii:3–5.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Printed primary sources

- Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, ed. B.M. Reichert (9 vols., Rome, 1894–1904).
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002).
- Hugh of St.-Cher, *In Evangelia secundum Matthaeum, Lucam, Marcum, et Joannem, Opera omnia in universum Vetus, & Novum Testamentum* (8 vols., Venice, 1703), vi.
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (7 vols., London, 1872–83).

Printed secondary works

- Cole, P.J., *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991).
- Duggan, A., ‘Conciliar Law, 1123–1215 – The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils’, in W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (eds.), *History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140–1244: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (Washington, 2008), pp. 318–66.
- Ghosh, K., *The Wycliffe Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Henquinet, F.M., ‘Les écrits de Frère Guerric de Saint-Quentin, O.P.’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 6 (1934), pp. 184–214, 284–312, 394–409.
- Henquinet, F.M., ‘Notes additionnelles sur les écrits de Guerric de Saint-Quentin’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 8 (1936), pp. 369–88.
- Maier, C.J., *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1998).

Appendix A(i)

Annotated condemnation text and English translation¹

128. Decem errores contra theologicam veritatem reperti in quibusdam scriptis (frat. Stephani?) et proscripti Parisiis a Guillelmo Parisiensi episcopo et Odone cancellario de consilio omnium magistrorum theologiae facultatis.

1241, Januarii 13, Parisiis.

Isti sunt articuli reprobatii contra theologicam veritatem et reprobatii a cancellario Parisiensi Odone et magistris theologie Parisius regentibus anno Domini M^oCC^oXL dominica secunda post octabas Natalis Domini.

These are the articles reprov'd/condemned as against theological truth and reprov'd/condemned by the chancellor of Paris, Odo, and the regent masters in theology at Paris, in 1240, on the second Sunday after the octaves of the Nativity.

***Primus* [error], quod divina essentia in se nec³ ab homine nec ab angelo videbitur.**

The first [error] is, that the divine essence in itself will be seen by neither man nor angel.

Hunc⁴ errorem reprobamus et assertores et defensores auctoritate Wilhermi episcopi excommunicamus. Firmiter autem credimus et asserimus, quod Deus in sua essentia⁵ vel substantia videbitur ab angelis et omnibus sanctis et videtur ab animabus glorificatis.

This error we reprove/condemn, and we excommunicate those asserting and defending it, by the authority of William, the bishop. Moreover, we firmly believe and assert that God in his essence or substance will be seen by the angels and all saints, and is seen by glorified souls.

***Secundus*, quod licet divina essentia una⁶ sit in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, tamen⁷ ut in ratione forme una est in Patre et Filio, sed non una in hiis cum Spiritu Sancto, et tamen⁸ forma hec idem sit quod divina essentia.**

Second, that although the divine essence is one in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, nevertheless that, with respect to form, it is one in the Father and Son, but not one in these with the Holy Spirit, and yet this form is the same as the divine essence.

Hunc errorem⁹ reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod una est essentia sive substantia¹⁰ in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto et eadem essentia in ratione forme.¹¹

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that the essence or substance is one in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and the essence is the same with respect to form.

Tertius, quod Spiritus Sanctus, prout est nexus vel amor, non procedit a Filio, sed tantum a Patre.

Third, that the Holy Spirit, as a bond or love, does not proceed from the Son, but only from the Father.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod prout est nexus vel amor, procedit ab utroque.¹²

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that as a bond or love, it proceeds from both.

Quartus,¹³ quod anime glorificate non sunt in celo empireo cum angelis, nec corpora glorificata erunt ibi, sed in celo aqueo vel cristallino, quod supra firmamentum est, quod¹⁴ et de beata Virgine presumitur.

Fourth, that glorified souls are not in the empyrean heaven with the angels, nor will glorified bodies be there, but in the aqueous or crystalline heaven, which is above the firmament; which they also presume to think concerning the blessed Virgin.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod idem locus corporalis, scilicet celum empireum, angelorum et animarum sanctarum erit et corporum glorificatorum.¹⁵

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that there will be the same corporeal place namely, the empyrean heaven, for angels and sanctified souls and glorified bodies.

Quintus,¹⁶ quod malus angelus in principio sue creationis fuit malus, et¹⁷ nunquam fuit nisi malus.

Fifth, that the evil angel was bad in the beginning of his creation, and never was anything but evil.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod¹⁸ bonus creatus sit et post peccando factus sit malus.

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that he was created good, and afterwards through sinning became evil.

Sextus,¹⁹ quod angelus in eodem instanti potest esse in diversis locis et esse ubique si voluerit.

Sixth, that an angel in the same instant can be in different places and be everywhere, if he wishes.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, credimus enim, quod angelus est in loco per diffinitionem, ita quod si est hic, non est alibi in eodem instanti; impossibile est enim quod sit ubique, hoc enim proprium est solius Dei.

We reprove/condemn this error, for we believe that an angel is in one defined place/place by definition so that, if he is here, he is not elsewhere in the same instant; for it is impossible that he be everywhere, for this is proper to God alone.

Septimus,²⁰ quod multe veritates sunt²¹ ab eterno, que non sunt Deus.

Seventh, that there are many truths from eternity, which are not God.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod una sola veritas sit ab eterno, que est Deus.²²

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that there is one truth alone from eternity, which is God.

Octavus,²³ quod primum nunc et creatio-passio possit non esse creata.

Eighth, that the first now/beginning of time and the creation-passion cannot have been created.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod utrumque et est creatum et creatura.

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that each is both created and creature.

Nonus, quod qui habet meliora naturalia, de necessitate plus habebit de gratia et gloria.²⁴

Ninth, that he who has greater natural gifts/talents will necessarily have more grace and glory.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod Deus secundum quod preelegit et preordinavit,²⁵ dabit unicuique gratiam et gloriam.

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that God will give grace and glory to each one according as he has pre-elected and preordained.

Decimus, quod malus angelus²⁶ nunquam habuit, unde stare posset, nec etiam Adam in statu innocentie.

Tenth, that the evil angel never had ground whereon he could stand, nor even Adam in his state of innocence.

Hunc errorem reprobamus, firmiter enim credimus, quod uterque habuit,²⁷ unde posset stare, non tamen, unde posset proficere.

We reprove/condemn this error, for we firmly believe that each one had the means whereby he could stand, but not whereby he could progress/profit.

Notes

- 1 Appendix A(i) aims to cover the main variations, not all their permutations or those which are contingent on format etc. It reproduces verbatim the text and main footnotes from *CUP*, i, no. 128, pp. 170–2. As the year in Paris started at Easter, the date for the condemnation translates as 13 January 1241.
- 2 In ms. Paris. 16360, in quo solo auctor nominator, non exprimitur, cujus ordinis fuerit iste fr. Stephanus. Matth. Paris. l. c. loquitur de ‘praecipuis Praedicatorum et Minorum lectoribus’. Habet maximam probabilitatem, praedictum fratrem fuisse fr. *Stephanum de Varnesia*, ord. Praed., qui a Stephano de Salanhac inter primos ord. magistros Paris. affertur (vide *Archiv f. Litterat.-und Kirchengesch.d.Mittelalt.*, II, 171, 205) et adhuc anno 1248 Parisius docebat. Errores supra relatos ab aliquibus ex Ord. Praed. fuisse progugnatos concludere debemus ex eo quod Cap. general. an. 1243 et 1256 et Capitulum provinciale provinciae Provinciae anni 1256 fratres obligavit, errores condemnatos ‘de quaternis’ abraderet.
- 3 In cod. Paris. 16533: ‘nec a sanctis animabus glorificatis nec ab angelis videtur vel videbitur’. In Burghes. 296, et in duobus primis codd. Parisien. etiam ‘videtur vel videbitur’.
- 4 ‘Hunc errorem ... excommunicamus’ deest ubique, praeter Bibl. Arsen. et Matth. Paris.
- 5 Codd. Burgh. et Parisienses addunt: ‘vel natura’.
- 6 Cod. Burgh. 296 et tres primi Paris.: ‘eadem’.
- 7 Burgh. Oxon., Vat. et omnes Paris.: ‘tamen ut hec essentia est in ratione forme’.
- 8 Codd. citati: ‘et in hiis tamen forma idem est quod’, etc.
- 9 ‘Hunc errorem ... credimus’ in citatis codd. hic et postea deest.
- 10 Citati codd. addunt ‘natura’.
- 11 Matth. et Paris. addunt: ‘eadem est in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto’.
- 12 Citati codd. et Oxon. addunt: ‘scilicet a patre et filio’.
- 13 Iste error in citatis codd. ponitur septimo, in Capitulo provinciali Ord. Praed. quinto loco.
- 14 Deest apud S. Bonaventuram; in citatis codd. et apud Matth. Paris.: ‘quod dicere etiam presumunt de beata Virgine’, in Paris. 15702 ‘etiam b. Virgo’.
- 15 Citati codd. et Matth. Paris. addunt: ‘et similiter locus idem spiritualis sanctorum angelorum (et beatorum hominum)’. Paris. 15702 addit adhuc ‘scil. Deus’.
- 16 Iste error in citatis codd. ponitur sexto, apud Matth. Paris. septimo, in Cap. provinciali octavo loco.
- 17 Arsen. ‘vel’.
- 18 Cit. codd.: ‘quod malus angelus aliquando fuit bonus et non malus’, etc.
- 19 In cit. codd. est octavus, apud Matth. Paris. quintus, in Cap. provinciali septimus, cum differentiis minoris notae.
- 20 In cit. codd. et in Cap. provinciali ponitur quarto, apud Matth. Paris. sexto loco.
- 21 In mss. citatis: ‘fuerunt’.
- 22 Additur ubique: ‘et quod nulla veritas fuit ab eterno, que non sit illa veritas’.
- 23 In cit. codd. ponitur quinto, in Cap. provinciali sexto loco. Ubique praeter Arsen.: ‘quod primum nunc et creatio-passio non sunt creator vel creatura’, et quoad veritatem oppositam: ‘Quod primum nunc et creatio-passio est creatura’.
- 24 ‘Et gloria’ desumptum est ex S. Bonaventura. Cit. codd.: ‘majorem gratiam et gloriam’. ‘Naturalia’ om. Arsen.
- 25 Cod. Paris. 16533: ‘secundum preordinationem et predestinationem’. Alii codd.: ‘secundum quod preordinatum est et predestinatum’; Paris. 15702 ‘sec. quod Deus preordinavit’.
- 26 Codd. cit.: ‘diabolus’.
- 27 Cod. Paris. 16533 solummodo: ‘ab initio, unde possent proficere’. Apud Matth. Paris. duo ultimi errores transponuntur.

Appendix A(ii)

Manuscripts containing the articles¹

- Assisi, 428, folio 1r (Franciscan origin).
- Auxerre, Bibl. Mun., 243 (206), folio 78r.
- Erfurt, CA Q, 151, folio 3r (late fourteenth century, grouped with the 1270 and 1277 condemnations).
- Escorial, T I, 15 (in fine 1 p. S. Thomae).
- Leipzig, Univ., 416, folio 163v (Franciscan origin).
- Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3798.
- Naples, VII, C, 12; the manuscript includes parts of Bonaventure's and Peter of Tarentaise's commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*.
- Oxford, Merton, 267, folios 117v–118r (corrected from 115v); variant on opening words: 'Isti sunt errores detestabiles ... a venerabile patre Guillelmo Parisiensi episcopo convocato consilio omnium magistrorum theologie tunc Parisius regentium'; the manuscript also includes a *correctorium* of Aquinas.
- Oxford, New College, 109, folio 1r (includes copy of Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*).
- Paris, Arsenal, 532, folio 219r; fourteenth/fifteenth century (the text preferred in the *CUP* as representing the first recension and largely in accordance with that of Matthew Paris).
- Paris, BN., Lat., 15661, folio 99v (late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, list grouped with 1270 and 1277 condemnations).
- Paris, BN., Lat., 15702, folio 186 (contains both the list of errors and the principia of Stephanus and other bachelors reading in the 1240s at Paris; it also includes a copy of Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*).
- Paris, BN., Lat., 15820, folio 193ra (fifteenth century, grouped with the 1270 and 1277 condemnations; the manuscript also includes a *correctorium* of Aquinas).
- Paris, BN., Lat., 16360, folio 3r (Brother Stephanus mentioned: '... quos dogmatisavit fr. Stephanus quos quicunque vel dogmatisavit vel defenderit, a ven patre domino Guillelmo ...').
- Paris, BN., Lat., 16533, folio 54r (tribus mss. a D'Argentré, Coll. Jud., f. 186, adhibitis).
- Rouen, 587, A, 263, folio 305r–306v (Franciscan origin).
- Turin, Univ., E V, 25, folio 218v (Franciscan origin).

- Valence Capit. (at end of first part of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*).
- Vatican, Bourg, 296 (at end of Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*).
- Vatican, Bourg, 361, folio 219v.
- Vatican, Lat., 692, folio 179v (Franciscan origin).
- Vatican, Lat., 4847, folio 66v.
- Vatican, Lat., 9821, folio 128.

Note

- 1 In the absence of a modern edited text, Appendix A(ii) reproduces the list of the condemnation's manuscripts as described in the *CUP*'s footnotes (no. 128, pp. 171–2) and in W.J. Courtenay, 'Dominicans and Suspect Opinion', *Vivarium*, 32 (1994), p. 187, n. 3. It includes some key points on specific manuscripts and some notes to help identify the folios.

Appendix B

Problematic thirteenth-century texts

This appendix summarises the texts composed by theologians in the period preceding or around the condemnation which could have contributed to the need to spell out the orthodoxy which was emerging, or had emerged, on the ten areas covered by the condemnation.

Article one: the beatific vision

Alexander of Hales

Alexander of Hales' 1220s *Glossa* on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* and his pre-1236/7 *Quaestiones Disputatae* '*Antequam esset Frater*' both contain passages of concern. His *Glossa* contains perhaps the most significant example – among other points potentially contravening article one, he identified three ways to see God's essence: 'through itself, through appearance/splendour, through likeness ('per se, per speciem, per similitudinem')'.¹ In the first way, it seems only God sees the divine essence, for he is 'lux inaccessibilis'. However 'light' can be understood in two ways, as in the air, where the eye can see it, or as in the sun, where it is invisible; and it is in this sense that the divine essence is invisible in itself; but as in each of us it is 'per gloriam', thus it is visible, and this is called 'species'; or it can be seen 'per similitudinem', which is creation. Alexander cited Augustine [*De Trinitate*, i, 8.16] saying that the dispensation of likenesses ('dispensatio similitudinum') is necessary for this, so that 'we may see God, which will not be [the case] in heaven'.² Subsequently, he discussed the reference in 1.Cor. xiii:12 to vision on earth 'through a mirror, in an enigma ('per speculum, in aenigmate')', with further definitions.³

Alexander's analysis is confusing, and the difficulty he encountered may have arisen from the addition of the concept of God's own vision of himself to that of the human vision of God, a new feature in thirteenth-century discussions. Nevertheless, his limitation of the vision of the divine essence to God alone, with humans seeing only 'per speciem' or 'per gloriam', departed sufficiently from the doctrine now established to cause concern among Franciscans in the 1250s. Richard Rufus tried to re-interpret the passage, and it disturbed 'pseudo-Rigaud', who contrasted Alexander's words with those of 1.Jn. iii:2, that 'we will see him as he is' ('videbimus eum sicuti est') and the *Glossa ordinaria*. Indeed, one

anonymous author felt he had to rectify Alexander's suspect position, adding that we will also see the divine essence 'in se'.⁴

Moreover, in his pre-1236 *quaestiones*, Alexander appears to vouchsafe for 'glorified souls', a less complete vision than for angels – our vision, even in heaven, will still be 'by way of the light existing proportionally ('sub ratione luminis proportionaliter')' – which may, or may not, be a weaker caveat than 'per gloriam' in his *Glossa*. Alexander argues prophetic vision is through a mirror, not face-to-face, because

[even] when vision will be in eternal ways ('rationibus aeternis'), when the intellect will not have an impediment from the part of the body, for which it now has desire, namely when there will be vision face-to-face, then the soul itself will still see it by way of the light existing proportionally. For just as the light of the sun in rotation is not proportionate to our vision according to itself, but according to what is in the air, so that divine light is not proportionate in itself, but according as it falls upon this or that intelligible thing.⁵

Hugh of St.-Cher

A second major theologian, one of whose works overstepped the emerging orthodoxy, was the Dominican theologian, later cardinal, Hugh of St.-Cher. While he generally adhered to the line prescribed in article one, in his *Postilla* on John's Gospel, a work circulating before 1240, Hugh used John Chrysostom's homilies to explain the words 'no-one ever sees him ('nemo vidit umquam')' [Jn. i:18], as against 'we will see him as he is ('videbimus eum sicuti est')' [1.Jn. iii:2]:

God is seen in many ways ... in heaven face-to-face ('facie ad faciem'): in none of those ways is he seen in his substance ('in substantia sua') but he is known by his own action ('actu suo') ... But why does 1 John say: ... 'We will see him as he is'? The answer must be that John did not mean to say we would in any way see God's substance in heaven, for this is impossible for any creature ... Therefore John meant mirror and enigma ('speculum et enigma') because in heaven we will see God openly through the unmediated receipt of light, but not his essence, but as glory, goodness, truth ('per immediatam acceptionem luminis aperte ..., non tamen essentiam, sed ut gloriam, ut bonitatem, ut veritatem').

This is unambiguously inconsistent with article one of the condemnation. Hugh's *Postilla* was accordingly corrected after the general and provincial Dominican chapters in 1243, 1244 and 1256.⁶

Guerric of St.-Quentin

Hugh's fellow Dominican, Guerric of St.-Quentin, also clearly shows the condemnation's impact. This is in three of his *quaestiones*, not his quodlibets,

which are unexceptionable. Dating the texts is difficult, but several of the quodlibets probably pre-dated 1230, with at least one, quodlibet three, later. Of the *quaestiones*, the first must pre-date the 1241/4 condemnation, or at least knowledge of what the required line would be, with question two corrected after this and question three post-dating question two.⁷ This prompts the speculation that discussions among Dominicans and at the university caused Guerric to move from an orthodox position in his quodlibets to the position later to be condemned, and could indicate that such views were becoming more prevalent within the order and at the university. But the dating is not sufficiently firm to make this more than a possibility, and indeed the first question could pre-date the quodlibets.

The *quaestiones* form a sequence. In the first, Guerric stated:

The essence will be seen, just as the *Glossa* says and the passage seems to imply, in the direction of Bernard [of Clairvaux]'s 'to know etc.' and Augustine. But it will not be seen as essence, because essence will not be the way ('ratio') of understanding, but power ('potentia') ... Love and faith are impressed forms ('formae impressae') and therefore seen through themselves. But God is the impressing form, not impressed ('forma imprimens, non impressa'); hence he will not be seen through himself but through the impressed form.

Guerric then backtracked. The second two versions of the question each contained a different solution. Moreover, on one of the many manuscript copies, a scribe added the marginal note on the first version: 'note that this question has been retracted and rejected by brother Guerric ('... questio ista retractata est et reprobata a fratre Guerrico')', and the solution has 'it is void ('vacat')' inserted after it. However, the corrections to the second question, whether by Guerric himself or by a copyist or reader, rendered it incoherent. Guerric therefore apparently rewrote the question in a third version, which goes as far as renouncing infinity as an attribute of the essence, albeit implying his uneasiness – he added the reservation 'without prejudice ('sine praeiudicio')', i.e. without prejudicing the truth. Guerric stated that 'the essence will be seen in itself as has been shown through authorities':

To the objection: 'How will God be seen in himself since he is simple', I reply without prejudice that it is true that God is simple and infinite, but his simplicity and infinity are not in the same way ... Hence [from earlier discussion] while simplicity is in respect of the part of the essence, infinity is not in respect of that part; and therefore infinity does not stop essence from being seen in the whole way of essence ('in ratione essentiae tota'). And this is what the *Glossa* said: 'Act that you may be holy and you will comprehend all', that is the whole essence in the way of essence, not however in the way of strength/power ('ratione virtutis').⁸

William of Auvergne

It also appears that William of Auvergne himself may once have held the doctrine later to be condemned. This was in an early work, *De retributionibus sanctorum* (the last chapter of his *De virtutibus*), probably written c.1227 and superseded by his later views.⁹ In it, William appears to envisage that we will see God as an image imprinted on a mirror which reflects onto the surface of a second mirror, which is an individual's intellect. Thus, in expounding 1.Cor. xiii:12 'We now see through a mirror in an enigma, but then face-to-face ('nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem')', William stated:

For the face of our mind ('facies ... nostri intellectus') to the face of the said mirror ('faciem dicti speculi') which is both the face of God ('Dei facies') and the outward countenance of God ('Dei vultus'), as we say, applied and adjusted ('applicata et coaptata'), will make present that face through impressed likeness ('expressa similitudine').

This implies William saw face-to-face vision in heaven, just as vision by faith on earth, as effected through a reflected image, but on earth, as in 1.Cor. xiii:12, as an enigma only. Indeed, all knowledge which is outside our souls, and which is neither the very essence of the soul nor part of it, neither a disposition nor an accident of it, is only apprehended by our souls through the impression of its own likeness.

William continued with a reference to Aristotle's discussion of how the image of a lion can be viewed in two ways, as an image and as the lion itself:

Therefore, observing thus something in respect of a thing, he sees not what he has in his eye but the thing itself through it; thus, looking at itself, the human mind in that glory properly sees not itself but God whose image is both a likeness and representation, perfected in accordance with the way that is fitting for it.¹⁰

Douai, MS 434

One final example comes from Douai, MS 434.¹¹ Question 480 noted that, because 'God is infinite ('infinitus') in both essence and strength/power ('et essentia et virtute')', therefore 'between God and the created mind there is no proportionality ('inter Deum et intellectum creatum nulla est proportio')'; thus 'no created mind can comprehend ('intelligere') God'; therefore 'neither human nor angel can comprehend God'.¹² If God's essence was infinite and a finite mind could not comprehend the infinite, then some intermediary was needed, preventing the direct vision implicit in article one. Alternatively, God's essence could not be infinite, or the finite human mind could somehow raise itself with divine help.¹³

Articles two and three: the Trinity

Alexander of Hales, Guerric of St.-Quentin, Albertus Magnus

This study has found no straightforward candidates among contemporary theologians who might have perpetrated article two's offending proposition. However, the related issues were discussed extensively and it is far from impossible that some works implied the doctrine later to be condemned in article two.¹⁴ For example, in his pre-Franciscan *quaestiones*, Alexander of Hales, like many others theologians, drew a distinction between the Father and Son, on the one hand, and the Holy Spirit, on the other:

When I say 'the Son is the image of the Father', an undifferentiated species is meant: for the Son is 'the species of the Father' ('species Patris') and 'undifferentiated'; hence he is his image. But the Holy Spirit, even if he is undifferentiated from the Father, is not however the species [of the Father]. And Richard [of St Victor, *De Trinitate*, vi,11] says that, because the Son has from the Father that he is a first principle of the Holy Spirit, he is the image of the Father; which is not fitting for the Holy Spirit.¹⁵

Similarly, in one of his quodlibets, Guerric of St.-Quentin distinguishes between the way the Son sees the Father and the way the Holy Spirit does:

The Holy Spirit sees the Father and the Son [sees the Father], but in a different way, because the Son sees the Father in himself because [he sees] the whole essence and the whole mode ('modum') of the Father, who is seen because he is from himself. But the Holy Spirit, even though he may see in himself the whole Father and the whole essence, however does not [see] the whole mode: but the Holy Spirit sees this in the Son.¹⁶

In his commentary on the *Sententiae*, and with the subject-matter – procession – showing a link between articles two and three, Albertus Magnus noted:

The Holy Spirit proceeds equally immediately from both, although some say otherwise; for the Saints speak jointly, that he proceeds from them inasmuch as they, being distinct in their own persons, are one in substance; and it is understood that substance and essence are not meant here in the absolute sense; but just as in the mode of potentiality which is joined to actuality as if a middle path ('medium') is made in the mind ('secundum intellectum') between pure essentialness and pure person-ness; and thus in such comparison there is one nature in the Father and Son as distinct beings because in this no relation of opposition divides them; and according to this, what proceeds from them as they are one, proceeds equally and immediately from both.¹⁷

Earlier in his commentary, Albertus had called the question of whether the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and Son as they are one or more a 'difficult

question'. He explained there that saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son as they are one meant that he proceeds from them in the plural – by saying one proceeds from two, so two are one in spiration. This appears to indicate the duality of the Father and Son, with the Holy Spirit set apart. Albertus further commented that, although there is one essence of the three [persons], there is not however the same relationship ('comparatio') of essence to 'notiones' and 'relationes' in the three.¹⁸ A similar discussion comes in Question 245, Douai, MS 434, attributed to 'G.', again in the context of the procession of the Holy Spirit. This asks why, since the Father and Son are the one principle/starting point of the Holy Spirit, they are not the same.¹⁹

While none of the above passages reflects article two's exact wording or import, they demonstrate the struggle to make sense of this area and the risks involved. Moreover, and equally significant in the light of article two's relationship with article three, those sympathetic to the single procession of the Holy Spirit without actually advocating this (since it was already well established as unacceptable to Catholic doctrine) may also have been drawn to the doctrine condemned in article two.

John Pagus

Turning to article three, the only visible culprit is John Pagus, with a reference – in a manuscript probably contemporary with him – explicitly linking him to the proposition condemned in article three:

Otherwise according to Pagus: ... the Holy Spirit can be considered in two ways, as the outside/limit ('extremum') or as the connection ('nexus') of the Father and Son. As he is the connection, thus he is constituted by way of one between ('sic se habet in ratione medii') ... For love in the way of one between does not proceed from the Father and Son, but proceeds from the Father into the Son as from one loving into one loved ('in ratione medii non procedit a Patre et Filio, sed procedit a Patre in Filium ut ab amante in amatum'), and according to this way the Holy Spirit ... is the Spirit of the Son, but not from the Son ('spiritus Filii, sed non a Filio').²⁰

Alexander of Hales, Guerric of St.-Quentin

While this study has found no other texts explicitly denying the dual procession, many works discuss the question in a constructive way, trying to accommodate both Latin and Greek positions and thus sometimes straying into dangerous territory. For example, Alexander of Hales, in his pre-Franciscan *quaestiones*, distinguished between the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Son as a beginning ('ab origine'), which is acceptable, and as something caused from a cause ('causatum a causa'), which is not. This is because cause implies, in itself, order in respect of duration, therefore cause is before what is caused; but beginning does not denote order in respect of actuality, but the order of nature.²¹

Second, in his quodlibets, Gueric of St.-Quentin noted the argument that ‘the Holy Spirit is *of* the Father in relation to (‘in’) the Son and *of* the Son in relation to the Father. Therefore it is not [right] to say that he would be *from* both in this way, because he would not be *of* the former in relation to the latter and vice versa’ (my italics); and ‘the Holy Spirit sufficiently proceeds from the Father, so making procession from the Son superfluous’. Gueric did not address the first argument. On the second, he stated, in an argument that is close to acknowledging belief in the single procession could be justified,

... according to all [people] the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father sufficiently as far as his complete being (‘ad esse totum’) but not as far as mode, and the mode is that he is shown [to be] the concord of the Father and the Son or the harmonious equality (‘concors aequalitas’), which is understood from his procession from both. His procession certainly could be understood to be from the Father and not from the Son, and through this they could have realised concord, but an equality of concord is not realised unless he is understood to proceed from them each in common.²²

Article four: the empyrean heaven

Despite copious discussion of the number and nature of the various heavens, their ordering, positioning and inhabitants, and including, for example, whether the outermost heaven can have a boundary, this study has found no contemporary texts which appear to contain the condemned proposition.

Articles five and ten: the origin of evil and Satan’s and Adam’s fall

John Pagus

There are two individuals in the frame for article five. First is John Pagus, with the second of the two errors attributed to him:

And it/he mentions Pagus’ opinion, that some became evil at once (‘quidam fuerunt statim mali’). But this is an error.²³

Alexander of Hales

The second candidate is Alexander of Hales (or the author of the relevant passages in the *Summa Fratris Alexandri*). The texts in question come from the *Summa* and two questions attributed to Alexander, *De libertate in angelo et homine* (from which the *Summa* passage is drawn) and *De peccato primi angeli*.²⁴ The *Summa* and *De libertate* discuss whether the evil angel was created bad. Unlike Peter Lombard, who envisaged a brief delay (‘morula’) between creation and fall, the *Summa*’s author denied the brief delay and argued that the first angel, created good, sinned immediately afterwards:

We therefore say that in one instant they began to be and in another they fell ('in alio instanti inceperunt esse et in alio se verterunt'), nor was there necessarily an intermediate time or duration between the two instances ('nec oportet inter illa duo instantia fuisse tempus medium vel durationem').²⁵

Moreover, in *De peccato*, Alexander stated 'he fell at once ('statim cecidit')'. However, the original text of the question *De libertate* was recast, with the copyist also adding a note in the margin:

If it should be supposed there was any delay or intermediate duration ('aliqua morula vel duratio intermedia'), and it was asked how he spent it, it could be said that at that time he was moved through the mind and not through disposition ('per intellectum et non ... per affectum'), namely by the motion in respect of which real goodness or conversion [to/from good/evil] is defined ('motu scilicet penes quem determinatur bonitas actualis vel conversio'). For it would not be contradictory to say he was moved through disposition by natural motion, not by grace ('per affectum motu naturali, non gratuito'), through which motion he was neither deserving nor not deserving ('nec meretur nec demeretur').²⁶

The copyist of *De libertate* then gave further reasons to show that the angel did not sin 'in the very instant of his creation ('in ipso instanti creationis')'. The whole question, in its recast form, was then included in *Summa* ii, Q.2, almost verbatim, including the marginal addition. Consequently, in a second limb to his response, the *Summa*'s author appears to contradict his first solution:

Solution: we allow that they did not become bad in the very instant that they came into existence ('non sit simul in ipso instanti, in quo fuerunt angeli, fuerunt mali').

The *Summa*'s author then stated at the end of the passage: 'The statements ('sententiae') of the Master of the *Sententiae* who said there was then a delay ('qui dicit fuit ibi morula') should be adhered to'.²⁷ This same observation comes in the same position in *Summa* iii, Q.2, which discussed the delay in the context of the reasons for Satan's fall.²⁸ Clearly, the author felt it necessary to leave no doubt on the issue and to demonstrate the correctness of his revised position.

Article ten

This book has found no contemporary texts from Paris theologians directly reflecting the proposition condemned in article ten.²⁹ However, those advocating article five's banned proposition may also implicitly have inclined to article ten's position.

Article six: angelic movement and location

Guerric of St.-Quentin

One theologian who may have held the view later condemned was Guerric of St.-Quentin. Angelic movement and the implications of their incorporeality generally figured prominently in his quodlibets. On the specific issue in article six, drawing on the different status and roles of angels in the pseudo-Dionysian hierarchy, he stated:

Version V: Some are in charge of the country generally ('praesunt generaliter provinciae'), some [are in charge of] some person specifically – hence we can say he [an angel] can operate in many places not by elicitation ('elicitive') but by order. When therefore he operates by elicitation, he is in that place, not when he operates by order. About the second [angel] who is present specifically to someone, we say that he cannot operate in very many places at the same time ('simul') either by elicitation or by order.

While 'simul' refers explicitly to the second angel, negating it for him implies it applies to the first. A second version, *P*, omits the critical word 'simul', but it is unclear if this is significant or which version came first.³⁰ The passage may suggest Guerric held the condemned view. Moreover, in a further quodlibet, Guerric's discussion included some arguments which may suggest that the respondent advocated the view to be condemned in article six – such a proposition is implicit in an argument Guerric imputed to the respondent on the sun's rays, although this could simply be part of standard scholastic argumentation:

Wherefore he [the respondent] conceded that an angel remaining in heaven in respect of his substance operates on earth according to his own will and God's command ('nutum'), like the sun remaining in its own orb operates everywhere on earth. Therefore the angel also, since he is more powerful than the sun, while remaining in the empyrean heaven could operate on earth.

Against. The power of an angel is limited. Therefore his power [is limited], if it is here it is not there. But wherever/whenever an angel operates, he operates through power. Therefore the power of an angel by which he now operates in England and his power by which he now operates in another place, if it is the same [power], changes place....

Again, God, because [he is] everywhere through essence, operates everywhere ... Therefore an angel will not operate except where he is through essence.

On the specific objection about the sun, Guerric stated:

[I]t can be said, as [John] Damascene said, that the sun is either greater than or equal to the earth ... and its strength can be diffused through everything. The angel is different because he does not have dimensional quantity according

to which his strength could be stretched forth, but his strength is only where his essence is.³¹

Guerric's position overall is unclear. But he appears at least to entertain the idea that an angel, albeit only one with a superior nature, can be in more than one place at the same time, if God sanctions this. This seems dubious in the light of article six of the condemnation.

More generally, Albertus Magnus' commentary on the *Sententiae* demonstrates that the view condemned in article six was held by some 'moderns'. In discussing angelic movement, Albertus refers to 'others, who say that the angel is at the same time in many places' which 'is held to be heresy, since he should have substance according to the words of the saints'.³² Whether these 'others' were Latins is unclear.

Article seven: eternal truths that are not God

Evidence from William of Auvergne, Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon

Turning to those theologians who might have advanced any of the positions underlying article seven, it is clear that avoiding implying that multiple eternal truths existed was far from straightforward. For example, on stateables as eternal truths, William of Auvergne affirmed that there were many who held, or had held, such a view, although he did not identify them by name. However, while he did not specify that the people he referred to were at the university, there is nothing to suggest they were not, something he often made clear.³³

The risk is demonstrated further by Roger Bacon's criticism of Robert Grosseteste and others. Robert Grosseteste's *De veritate*, probably from the early 1230s – followed by Richard Rufus, in his *Metaphysics* commentary, from the 1230s or 1240s – argued that 'you cannot say many truths or all truth unless many truths have been presupposed ('suppositae')', and that 'therefore in such expressions the truths of things ('veritates') should be presupposed which conform to the principles of things in eternal truth ('rationibus rerum in aeterna veritate')'. Thus created things are only true when they conform to the principles of eternal truth, i.e. of God. It follows that there are many truths from eternity, but not many eternal things: their eternal nature depends on God's mind to exist, and, ultimately, their multiplicity relates to created things.³⁴ In response, Roger Bacon, in a passage from his *Quaestiones primae* covering both stateables and concepts, probably written in the 1240s, before he became a Franciscan, and apparently referring to Grosseteste's views, stated:

Certain men deny plurality and none the less say that there are truths from eternity; for they say that such truths are only true insofar as they are known and they are only known by the Truth that is the First Cause – and [in this way] they disallow a plurality. Others claim that they are true absolutely, yet they [too] deny plurality, since the truth of things is subject to the divine

knowledge and that is one ... [O]thers assert that there are truths in the ideal reasons but not in the proper natures of things or in those things' proper entity.

Bacon contrasts these positions unfavourably with his own view that, while there may be truths from eternity, this cannot be the case with propositions, since these can only exist in an intellect and depend on non-eternal angels or humans. But, as Bacon himself then continues with the observation that 'I say that there are many true things from eternity ('plura vera ab aeterno')', his own position appears problematic.³⁵

Richard Rufus

Turning to the question of God's knowledge, Richard Rufus is in the frame.³⁶ Three of the works by or attributed to him – *De ideis*, his commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* and his commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* – demonstrate an alternating sequence of thought that makes connection with the condemnation tempting. He was probably in Paris when he wrote *De ideis* (probably c.1236 when a secular arts student), but this predated the condemnation's dictates. He was possibly also in Paris when he wrote his *Metaphysics* commentary, probably still before the condemnation but the emerging position may have already been known and influenced his views. However, this might not have applied in Oxford when he returned to England and could revert to his original view in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, even after the condemnation was issued in Paris. However, this is not verifiable since both the chronology of Rufus' works and his location is disputed, as is the attribution to him of the *Metaphysics* commentary in particular.³⁷ Nevertheless, with that caveat, it appears that his view, at least initially, was likely to have been incompatible with article seven as it subsequently emerged, and this was the position he held in his final discussion on the issue.

In *De ideis*, Rufus departed from what was perhaps the more common thirteenth-century view that God had a single idea which is God. The context was philosophical rather than theological – whether separated intelligences, in particular the First Cause, understand sensible individuals; but the Christian equation of the First Cause with God meant God's simplicity and unchangeability was the underlying issue.³⁸ Rufus claimed the First Cause knows sensible things because it is the first cause of the idea of each:

And who doubts created nature to be truly and completely known [by him], if its individual appearance and idea ('propria species et idea') was known? Moreover he is the first cause of the individual idea of all singular created things ('causa prima singulorum creatorum ideae propriae').

Rufus argued that God knows each individual creature and that all those who expound sacred scripture supported this position. The species of all things God

will create are present to him so he knows them each individually. Moreover, if they have individual natures, separated intelligences must be able to understand individual things if they are to know themselves. Such self-knowledge must exist, since, for separated intelligences, act and substance are the same: they are what they understand. Rufus stated:

[I]t is improbable that they do not know themselves since ... their act is their substance ('sua actio sua substantia est').³⁹

Rufus believed that there was an idea for each individual and for prime matter. However, what God understands is one. On the question of how something can be both one and many, he denied that one idea 'consignifies' many things, seeing this as semantics. So God must understand what is one and also many in some miraculous way ('miro modo'). In effect, God understands all things in one act of understanding, possible because they are all united in what is, ultimately, one simple species. Thus the unity of God's understanding comes from his single act and is unaffected by the plurality of the things understood.⁴⁰ This goes beyond the claim that the nature of things is only eternal through God's knowledge of them: it potentially leaves a plurality of ideas whose status is independent of God's knowledge although caused by him; and, unless a full pantheism is envisaged, it is difficult to see how they can all 'be God'. Hence, Rufus' theory may have fallen foul of article seven.

This was Rufus' view in c.1235, but, in an intriguing twist in the context of the condemnation, it apparently changed a few years later. In his *Metaphysics* commentary, he argued that plurality comes only from created things:

To another question it should be said that God is one idea and not more ('una idea tantum et non plures') ... In another way it should be said that he is many ideas ('plures ideae'), that is there are many principles ('plures rationes') in him. That plurality of principles ('pluritas rationum') is from the relation of his own substance to the many created things ('ex relationae suae substantiae ad plura creata'). Hence the whole plurality comes from the part of created things ('ex parte creatorum').

Then, in a further twist, Rufus appears to have reverted to his previous view: in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, probably composed when a theologian at Oxford in the 1250s, Rufus cited Augustine for the view that there are infinite things in God's wisdom and, if looked at from a human perspective, God knows an infinite number of creatures.⁴¹

Alexander of Hales

Returning finally to Alexander of Hales and his works prior to his quaestio on truth in the *Quaestiones universitatem*, these seem to show a shift from a starting point comparable to Rufus'. In his 1220s *Glossa*, Alexander appears to have held

that, while God's wisdom is single, 'there are many ideas and principles ('ideae ... plures et rationes plures')', citing Augustine in support, and that 'therefore, just as there are many things known, so are there many ideas ('sicut res cognitae sunt plures, ita ideae plures')'. Indeed, he concludes: 'it is thus in God, that many ideas should be said in respect of the multitude of things known ('respectu multitudinis rerum cognitarum dicuntur multae ideae')'.⁴² However, his position had hardened even by the time of his pre-Franciscan questions (probably written later but before c.1236). Alexander's Question 46 does not discuss divine knowledge specifically, but he makes it clear, citing Augustine again despite his slight shift of position, that while there are many principles when considered from the perspective of things, there is only one in relation to God ('ex parte creaturarum habet quod sit "multae", ex parte autem Dei, quod sit "una"'). A further pre-Franciscan question, *De scientia divina*, states that any multiplicity in ideas is not in reality.⁴³

Article eight: time and creation

Richard Rufus

Given article eight's complexity, whether a text contravenes, or would have contravened, it can be ambiguous. But Richard Rufus appears to do so in a commentary on Aristotle's *Physics* attributed to him, probably as a Paris arts student, c.1235 and hence, as *De ideis*, predating the condemnation. Rufus argued:

[T]he non-being of the world was before its being in one way and yet in itself does not fall before or after ... [T]he non-being of creation has its sole existence in the Creator. Therefore the exitus of non-being into being is its flowing from the Creator. We therefore understand the Creator as something indivisible, much as a point here, and the being of creation as a line flowing from the point. And we understand the point thus remaining and the line as flowing, and it will be still [right] to say that in the point does not fall before nor after, and nevertheless the point is before that line or anything of it. And it is in this way that one can say that the non-being of the world is before its being, and nevertheless in itself its non-being is neither before nor after

Thus, non-being existed before being, flowing from it, with no first moment of time. So,

we understand the first being ('ens primum') as indivisible ('indivisible') and that there is some flowing ('fluxum') of temporal things (temporalium') from it. Hence it appears that the flowing itself is from something else ('ab alio'), that is, it is not said to be first in itself ('in ipso ... primum'). Thus it is in the creation or change ('motus') of the world that the thing from which that flowing is, is something indivisible, and in the being ('esse') of those things there should not be said first ('primum').⁴⁴

Rufus' argument is complex and his position subtle. However, it seems to rest on the idea that, if there is a line with two ends, any change occurs within the line with the two end points excluded – the line with its flowing nature itself has no first or last instant. The world and its flow or change start with God, the 'punctus' or 'ens indivisibile', but God himself is not subject to the flow or to change. As change ('motus') is interdependent on time ('tempus'), with change ontologically but not temporally prior to time, the same applies to time. Thus there is no created first moment of time: this is God. God, in whom no before or after exists, is not before creation in time although he is existentially, and time is continuous from eternity with no first instant.⁴⁵ However, Rufus can still argue that the world and time had a beginning, from which they flowed, and he advances six arguments to demonstrate this.

Nonetheless, as with his position on God's knowledge, and again possibly implying a link with the emerging orthodoxy to be encapsulated in the condemnation, Rufus subsequently changed his view. In his *Metaphysics* commentary, Rufus stated that God created the world from nothing and it had a limit within itself (a first moment), not merely outside itself, and he argued explicitly that 'heaven was created in the first instant of time ('in primo instanti temporis')'. Indeed, he describes his earlier view as nonsense ('illud nihil est').⁴⁶

Alexander of Hales

A similar idea may also underlie the discussion in *Quaestio* 6A of Alexander of Hales' *Quaestiones universitatem*. Alexander stated:

Therefore, it should be said that time began to be in that 'now' which alone is the beginning of the future; and vice versa, it will cease to be in that 'now' which alone is the end of the past. Nor is it right that time was in the first 'now' in which it began to be, but it sufficed that after that 'now' it had being, since successive things are not in their own beginning; hence, when it is said concerning such things 'this began to be', it does not follow that it is that thing [i.e. its own beginning], but rather that it is not, but that after this it will be present; for time is from the genus of successive things, therefore, etc. Similarly, it is from the part of the ending: for just as successive things do not have being in their own beginning, so neither in their final ending; hence it is not right that time is in the final 'now' ('ultimo "nunc"'), in which it will cease to be, but rather that it is not in that, but that it was before.⁴⁷

Article nine: grace, gifts and glory

Guerric of St.-Quentin

Contemporary theologians whose discussions may have reflected the proposition to be condemned include Guerric of St.-Quentin, whose quodlibets reflect

Peter Lombard's hierarchical account and seem questionable, although only applying to angels:

To that [point] that angels can be elevated by things merited above others, this can be said in two ways: in one way thus, that as Augustine said, 'All spirits are ministering', but nevertheless the greater one through a mediator, the lesser ones without a mediator, because the greater ones influence the ministry for the lesser ones, and therefore all deserve and are rewarded according to their own fitness for acceptance; or thus, that they do not deserve to receive/[earn] anything ('aliud habendum') not received/[earned] ('habitu'), but so that they should receive/[earn] that better thing. Hence there is one reward of substance, but the aureole which shines from things merited [is multiple] because the individual things merited shine out. Thus, it can be varied in them and in this the aforesaid reward is varied among ... those ministering. But those who now have more capacity in respect of substance and intellect then likewise will [have more] as far as [reward] of substance.⁴⁸

Gueric's remarks go further than discussions by many theologians on reward through merit and specifically discuss reward resulting from natural capacity, the territory of article nine.

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 Medieval theologians used 'per speciem' ambiguously, with its meaning apparently including 'per essentiam' as well as 'through appearance/splendour' (the probable meaning here), and 'through its likeness'. For example, Peter Lombard (*Sententiae*, i, 1.3, p. 57) may refer to essence when he wrote of the future 'sed ibi proprie, perfecte et plene, ubi per speciem videbimus quo fruemur', contrasting this with 'hic autem, dum in spe ambulans, fruimur quidem, sed non adeo plene'. Albertus Magnus, *In IV Sent.*, 49.5 (Borgnet, xxx), p. 670, stated that God may not be seen through a 'speciem' which is him himself, but through a 'speciem' received from him (perhaps demonstrating a dual usage within one sentence, or a finessing of language). Aquinas may have used 'per speciem' to stand for 'representation' or 'likeness', not identical with the thing to be known, but the 'indirect representative means' (R.T. Lambert, *Self knowledge in Thomas Aquinas* (Bloomington, 2007), pp. 87–8). However, Aquinas makes a distinction between physical objects, where only a likeness of the object is in the mind (a stone itself cannot be in the mind) and God, who can be seen immediately/without medium ('immediate') when his essence is actually conjoined with our mind (R. Pasnau, *Theories of Cognition* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 199). For a discussion of 'species' in Aquinas and later medieval theologians, see Pasnau, *op.cit.*, especially pp. 14–7. Pasnau, pp. 101–3, notes that many scholastics 'characterized species as likenesses without ever clarifying the sense of likeness they had in mind', contrasting this with William of Auvergne's discussion of the intellect's receipt in itself of 'likenesses' ('similitudines') or signs ('signa') of all things to which it is joined by this kind of [spiritual] connection' (William of Auvergne, *De anima* (*Opera omnia*, ii, supplement), p. 215, 2).

- 2 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, p. 16, paragraph 18.
- 3 Op.cit., p. 17, paragraph 21.
- 4 For this analysis, see H.-F. Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium de la vision', *RTAM*, 19 (1952), pp. 79–82. Dondaine cites Oxford, Balliol, MS 62, f. 16rb (Rufus); Bruxelles, Bibl. Roy., MS 1542, f. 250 and Troyes, MS 1862, f. 218va ('ps.-Rigaud'); and Vat., Lat., MS 691, f. 62va (anon.). The anonymous text reads: 'Et tamen si dicitur videri *in se*, id est in sua essentia, non est vera distinctio: quia in patria videbimus eum secundum essentiam sive eius essentiam. Si dicitur *in se* videri, id est a se comprehendi, sic verum dicitur. Cum ait videri *per speciem*, est ipsum videre existentem in nobis secundum possibilitatem recipientis, non secundum modum recepti. Et sic fruente Deum vident immediate, sed non totaliter'. While Alexander is not named, the passage clearly reproduces his argument.
- 5 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, p. 301.
- 6 Hugh of St.-Cher, *In evangelia secundum Joannem (Opera omnia in universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (8 vols., Venice, 1703), vi, pp. 286–7. The authenticity of Hugh's *Postilla* on John's Gospel is certain from its colophon, but not whether Hugh wrote it all, given his multiple roles (Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium', pp. 82–4). Beryl Smalley, 'A Commentary on Isaias by Guerric of Saint-Quentin, O.P.', *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (6 vols., Rome, 1946), ii (offprint), p. 13, describes Hugh as 'a great exponent of the paste-and-scissors method', who probably did not think through 'the implications of his interpretation of the prophecies'.
- 7 Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002), pp. xvi–xxxv, 21; B.-G. Guyot and H.-F. Dondaine, 'Guerric de Saint-Quentin et la condamnation de 1241', *RSPT*, 44 (1960), pp. 225–42; B.-G. Guyot, 'Quaestiones Guerrici', *AFP*, 32 (1962), pp. 5–125.
- 8 For this analysis and the texts, see Guyot and Dondaine, 'Guerric de Saint Quentin', pp. 232–3, 226, 240–2. See also above, p. 179, n. 6. The idea of an impressed image appears similar to the Franciscan John of La Rochelle's later statement that 'natural law is the idea of eternal law impressed in our minds' (John of La Rochelle, *Tractatus de legibus*, no. 241, cit. L. Smith, *The Ten Commandments* (Leiden, 2014), p. 22).
- 9 P.-M. de Contenson, 'La théologie de la vision de Dieu', *RSPT*, 46 (1962), pp. 409–44.
- 10 William of Auvergne, *De retributionibus sanctorum (Opera omnia*, i), pp. 315–28, in particular p. 317, 1A-C, p. 318, 1G-2E; Contenson, 'La théologie de la vision', pp. 411, 416–7, 420. Contenson postulates Aristotle, *De memoria et reminiscencia*, i, 1, as William's likely source.
- 11 P. Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *RTAM*, 10 (1938), p. 239.
- 12 Dondaine, 'L'objet et le medium', p. 94.
- 13 L. Sweeney, *Divine Infinity in Greek and Medieval Thought* (New York, 1992), pp. 337–63.
- 14 Out of the 572 entries in Douai, MS 434, there are around seventy-three questions linked to the Trinity, together covering a wide range of issues (Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', passim). This is a significant proportion, demonstrating both the subject's importance and its difficulty.
- 15 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, p. 468. See also Alexander, *Summa*, i, Q.2.a.89, p. 141–6, for a similar argument.
- 16 Guerric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, pp. 239–40.
- 17 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 12.1 (Borgnet, xxv), p. 355. See also above, p. 103, n. 77.
- 18 Op.cit., 11.3-4, pp. 339–40.
- 19 Glorieux, 'Les 572 questions', p. 145.
- 20 Anon, *Tractatus de fide*, Münster, Universitätsbibl., MS 257, ff. 72vb-73va (cit. H. Hansen, *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories* (Leuven, 2012), pp. 18–22, see above, pp. 22–3, 28, n. 12); P. Glorieux, 'Les années 1242-1247', *RTAM*, 29 (1962), pp. 234–49.
- 21 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, i, p. 77.
- 22 Guerric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, pp. 236–8.

- 23 Paris, BN., Lat., MS 15652, f. 54rb (cit. Hansen, *John Pagus*, pp. 18–22, see above, pp. 22–3, 28, n. 12).
- 24 Alexander, *Summa*, ii, Q.2.a.159, pp. 208–10 (and op.cit., iii, Q.1.aa.90–2, pp. 106–11); *De libertate in angelo et homine*, Vat., Lat., MS 782, ff. 46va–47vb; *De peccato primi angeli*, Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16406, f. 26ra. Victorin Doucet ('La date des condamnations parisiennes (Louvain, 1947)', pp. 190–2) identified these four texts – his article forms the basis for this analysis.
- 25 Alexander, *Summa*, ii, Q.2.a.159, pp. 209.
- 26 The above text is from *Summa*, ii, Q.2.a.159, pp. 209. However, it is almost identical to the copyist's marginal note in *De libertate*.
- 27 Alexander, *Summa*, ii, Q.2.a.159, pp. 210.
- 28 Alexander, *Summa*, iii, Q.1.a.90, p. 107. According to Doucet, 'La date', pp. 190–2, such a reference to Peter Lombard is unusual.
- 29 Curiously, Andreas de Castro's fourteenth-century commentary on the *Sententiae*, i, 45, reproduces article ten, alone from the condemnation, verbatim, showing that the 1241/4 list was still being consulted in the fourteenth century (R.L. Friedman, 'Andreas de Novo Castro (fl. 1358) on Divine Omnipotence', *Cahiers de L'Institut du Moyen-Age Grec et Latin*, 64 (1994), p. 127).
- 30 Gueric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, p. 289.
- 31 Gueric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, pp. 379–82. Why England was chosen as an example remains unclear.
- 32 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 37.24 (Borgnet, xxvi), p. 266.
- 33 William of Auvergne, *The Providence of God*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2007), pp. 112–3.
- 34 For Robert Grosseteste likely links with Paris and friendship with William of Auvergne, see Appendix C. For *De veritate*'s date, see R. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1992), p. 113. For the passage from Grosseteste's *De veritate* and explanation of his view, see T.B. Noone, 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*', *Vivarium*, 35:2 (1997), pp. 259–60. For Rufus' *Metaphysics* commentary, see below, n. 37.
- 35 Roger Bacon, *Quaestiones primae*, ii, VII.41–2 (cit. Noone, 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus', pp. 260–2); A. Power, *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 37–8.
- 36 For what follows, see R. Wood, 'Distinct Ideas and Perfect Solitude', *Franciscan Studies*, 53 (1993), pp. 7, 14.
- 37 See Appendix C. Rufus was in Paris early in his career. The attribution of the *Metaphysics* to him is disputed. Rega Wood, 'The Earliest Known Surviving Western Medieval *Metaphysics* Commentary', *MPT*, 7 (1998), pp. 39–49, argues strongly for its attribution to Rufus, but Edith Sylla expresses reservations (review of *Richard Rufus of Cornwall. In Physicam Aristotelis*, <https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/23840-richard-rufus-of-cornwall-in-physicam-aristotelis-auctores-britannici-medii-aevi-xvi/> (26 January 2016)). Timothy Noone, 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus', p. 253, dates Rufus' *Metaphysics* commentary to the late 1240s in England, but Rega Wood, 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall on Creation', *MPT*, 2 (1992), p. 3, places it before 1238 in Paris. Wood also dates a commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, almost certainly by Rufus, to Paris pre-1235 (op.cit., p. 4). See also T.B. Noone, 'An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum super Metaphysicam*' (University of Toronto, Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp. 309–10; C.H. Lawrence, 'The Letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan School at Oxford', *JEH*, 42 (1991), pp. 234–5, 237. For Rufus' commentary on the *Sententiae*, see Wood, 'Distinct Ideas', pp. 18–21.
- 38 For the First Cause and Neoplatonism, see above, pp. 69–70.
- 39 Wood, 'Distinct Ideas', pp. 7, 14.
- 40 Op.cit., pp. 16–9.
- 41 Noone, '*Scriptum super Metaphysicam*', pp. 309–10; Wood, 'Distinct Ideas', pp. 18–21.

- 42 Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 36, pp. 358–9, i, 45, pp. 453–4; Augustine, *Question 46 (Responses to Miscellaneous Questions)*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008), pp. 59–60.
- 43 Alexander, *Quaestiones*, ii, pp. 783–811, especially pp. 799–800, citing Augustine, ‘Question 46’ again, together with *De Trinitate* [*The Trinity*] trans. E. Hill (New York, 1991), vi, 10, p. 215; Alexander, *op.cit.*, iii, pp. 1458–68. For the attribution of *De scientia divina* to Alexander, see Wood, ‘Distinct Ideas’, pp. 9–14.
- 44 For this analysis, see Wood, ‘Richard Rufus of Cornwall on Creation’, pp. 7–9, citing Rufus (?), *In Physic. Aristot.* 8.1–2 (Richard Rufus, *In Physicam Aristotelis*, ed. R. Wood (Oxford, 2004)). I am grateful to Cecilia Trifogli for her help on these passages.
- 45 R. Wood, ‘Roger Bacon: Richard Rufus’ Successor as a Parisian Physics Professor’, *Vivarium*, 35 (1997), p. 229.
- 46 Rufus follows Grosseteste here (Wood, ‘Roger Bacon’, p. 231). See also Wood, ‘Richard Rufus on Creation’, pp. 7–15.
- 47 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 212–3. See also pp. 193–4.
- 48 Guerric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, pp. 403–4.

Appendix C

Biographical notes¹

This appendix offers brief notes on some of the individuals discussed in this book whose actions or works may have influenced the condemnation's imposition or contents. Its main focus is those at the university at Paris in the period around the condemnation, but it includes Robert Grosseteste because of the relevance of his works and probable friendship with William of Auvergne.

Individuals with authority at the university at Paris in the early 1240s

Odo of Châteauroux

Odo (†1273) was a theology master in Paris from c.1229, chancellor of the university, 1238–44, cardinal from 1244. He appears to have chaired the Paris theology masters in formulating the 1241/4 condemnation. His surviving works mainly comprise sermons, with around 1,200 extant (only two of the quodlibets once attributed to him are now considered to be his). Odo was heavily engaged in action against the Jews in the 1240s, both the initial examination after the trial of the Talmud in 1240 and its later condemnation in 1248, the condemnation of John of Brescain and master Raymond in 1247, and the crusades (in particular Louis IX's, from 1248 to 1254). Both Gregory IX (whose favour he gained in preaching and in supporting the university in its 1229–31 strike) and Innocent IV (who promoted him to cardinal) favoured him.²

William of Auvergne

William (†1249) was a theology master in Paris by 1223, bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249. The 1241/4 condemnation was issued under his authority. William wrote his major work, the *Magisterium divinale et sapientiale*, from the early 1220s to the 1240s. He was intermittently in favour with Gregory IX (as when unexpectedly elevated to his bishopric after approaching the pope over what he saw as an invalid election in 1227/8), but also heavily criticised by him (as during the 1229–31 strike, when he did not support the university against the civil authorities). He was involved in most events in Paris involving the university, including the actions against the Jews and against John of Brescain and master

Raymond. William frequently advised Louis IX and the papacy, for example, on reforming monasteries in France for Pope Honorius III, 1224–5, and in providing diplomatic help to Louis IX in Brittany, 1230.³

Franciscans

Alexander of Hales

Alexander (†1245), an Englishman, was in Paris by 1210 and a regent theology master c.1225–45. He became a Franciscan in 1236, with his theology chair thus passing to the order. His earlier works included his *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi* and his *Quaestiones disputatae ‘antequam esset frater’*. Other works included his *Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent*, probably after becoming a Franciscan. As a Franciscan, Alexander was also responsible for the major Franciscan work, the *Summa theologica* (or *Summa Haliensis*), although much of it was completed by his fellow Franciscan and ex-pupil John of La Rochelle, and by other Franciscans after his death.

John of La Rochelle

John (†1245) became a Franciscan, possibly c.1230. He was a pupil under Alexander of Hales, becoming a theology master at Paris in 1238 and succeeding to Alexander’s chair when he resigned it shortly before his death. His works included his *Summa de anima* and *Quaestiones de gratia*, and he collaborated with Alexander on the Franciscan *Summa theologica*, writing large parts, especially on moral law. Odo of Rigaud succeeded him as Franciscan theology master.

Richard Rufus⁴

The dates on which Rufus (†c.1260) was in Paris are uncertain, as are the dates of his works. He was variously in Paris (as an arts student in the 1230s when he probably wrote his commentary on Aristotle’s *Physics*), Oxford (as a theologian in the 1240s) and again in Paris (after 1256, as Franciscan regent theology master, an order he joined c.1238). He was one of the first Latins to study and lecture on Aristotle’s works on physics, metaphysics and epistemology, and to write treatises against Averroes. At Oxford in the 1240s Rufus lectured on Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae*. Robert Grosseteste was a major influence on his theology. Rufus also wrote two commentaries on Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae* and an epistemological treatise, *Speculum animae (A Mirror of the Soul)*.

Dominicans

Guerric of St.-Quentin

Guerric (†c.1244/5) became a Dominican in 1225 in Paris, with degrees already in both medicine and the arts. Following a period lecturing in Bologna, he was

a regent theology master at Paris from 1233 to 1242. His works include his *Quaestiones de quolibet* and probably an *Expositio super Apocalypsim*.

Stephen of Venizy

Stephen (fl.1230s/40s) was in Paris studying theology by 1237, lecturing on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* in 1240. He is usually identified with the 'Brother Stephanus' named in one manuscript of the 1241/4 condemnation. If so, his career nevertheless continued successfully, as he was among the regent theology masters listed in the 1248 condemnation of the Talmud (as Stephen of Auxerre, from where he originated).

Hugh of St.-Cher

Hugh (†1263) may have acquired a law degree before joining the Dominicans at Paris in 1226 when studying theology. He had possibly become a theology master by 1229, but his regency probably post-dated 1230. Hugh was provincial prior of France 1227–30 and 1236–44. Innocent IV appointed him cardinal-priest of St. Sabina in 1244. His works include a commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, disputed questions, sermons, and his *Postilla super totam bibliam*. This last work was carried out by a team of Dominicans under Hugh's direction. Its aim was to update the *Ordinary Gloss* (the collection of glosses on the Bible in various versions used as a standard reference text-book) with additional patristic citations and new material from studying Aristotle.

Godfrey/Godefroid of Bléneau

Godefroid (†1250) was a regent theology master at Paris from 1235 to 1242, succeeding Hugh of St.-Cher. He was one of those examining the Talmud in the early 1240s. His surviving works included sermons, biblical commentaries, disputed questions and a quodlibet. He attended the Council of Lyons in 1245 and became chaplain to Pope Innocent IV.

Roland of Cremona

Roland (†1259) became a Dominican as a student in Bologna in 1219. He was a pupil of John of St. Giles, becoming the first Dominican regent theology master at Paris in 1229 when the university went on strike. He moved to the new university at Toulouse to teach theology in 1230, subsequently becoming an inquisitor in Italy. His main work was a *Summa*, in the form of questions influenced by Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*.

Albertus Magnus

Albertus (†1280) studied at Padua before becoming a Dominican in 1223. He then studied theology at Cologne, moving to Paris in 1241 and lecturing on

Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* there. Albert became a regent theology master at Paris in 1245 and was one of those signing the condemnation of the Talmud in 1248. Later in 1248 he returned to Cologne, with Thomas Aquinas, his pupil, joining him there. Albert subsequently held various offices in the church, including papal judge delegate, prior provincial of Teutonia and, briefly, bishop of Regensburg. His works included a *Sententiae* commentary, a *Summa theologica* and numerous scientific works – Albertus had a keen interest in science and philosophy and made an exhaustive study of Aristotle and his Arab commentators.

Seculars

Philip the Chancellor

Philip (†1236) studied theology, probably at Paris (where he may also have studied the arts and canon law). He was archdeacon of Noyen by 1202 (continuing in this role until his death), possibly became theology master at Paris before 1217, and was chancellor of the university there from 1218 to 1236. Philip supported the university in the 1229–31 strike. He preached strongly against heretics in north and south France in the 1220s/30s and frequently served as a papal judge delegate between the years 1219 and 1235. Philip supported the mendicants as candidates for masters' chairs. He had a reputation as a major theologian, and was renowned as a musician and composer. His *Summa de bono* was his most famous work.

John Pagus

John (fl. first half thirteenth century) had a major reputation as an arts master, teaching logic at Paris and writing one of the first extant commentaries, *Rationes super Praedictamenta Aristotelis*, on Aristotle's *Categories*. He supported William of Auxerre and Godfrey of Poitiers in discussions with Pope Gregory IX on behalf of the university during the 1229–31 strike. John was regent theology master by the 1240s, with a commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* dating from that period.

Robert Grosseteste⁵

Whether Robert Grosseteste (†1253) ever studied in Paris, or even visited there, is disputed. It is known that he served Bishop William de Vere, in the Hereford diocese, but this must have ended with the bishop's death in 1198. From 1198 to 1225 there is no clear record of his whereabouts, but it seems probable that he at least visited Paris in this period and became friendly with William of Auvergne, whose views were often very similar to his own.⁶ By 1225 he was at the university at Oxford, lecturing, and also for a time its chancellor. From 1230 to 1235 he became the first lecturer at the Oxford Franciscans' studium, before becoming bishop of Lincoln, retaining this position until his death.

Grosseteste's early works demonstrate his great interest in philosophy and science, including treatises on comets and the generation of sounds. Soon after 1220 he studied Aristotle in depth, writing commentaries on his *Posterior Analytics* and *Physics*. This interest continued throughout his life with further works. Grosseteste also wrote theological treatises, including *De veritate* (*On Truth*), *De veritate propositionis* (*On the Truth of the Proposition*), *De Scientia Dei* (*On God's Knowledge*) and *De intelligentiis* (*On Intelligences*), as well as a *Hexaameron*. He started learning Greek in the 1220s, and made numerous translations with commentaries, including of pseudo-Dionysius' four major works.

Notes

- 1 For useful summaries of the lives of the theologians discussed in Appendix C, on which the appendix draws, see S.E. Young, *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 212–31; P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris* (2 vols., Paris, 1933–4); J.R. Ginther, *The Westminster Handbook to Medieval Theology* (Louisville, Kentucky, 2009).
- 2 *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (17 vols., Paris, 1937–95), iv, 2, pp. 1675–8; A. Callebaut, 'Le sermon historique d'Eudes de Châteauroux', *AFH*, 28 (1935), p. 97; M.M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires de 1230–1231* (Paris, 1931), pp. 128–30. For Odo's career, see A. Charansonnet, 'L'université, l'Eglise et l'Etat' (Lyon University, PhD thesis, 2001). For Odo's quodlibets, see 'Quodlibase', <http://quodlibase.chess.fr> (10 January 2014).
- 3 N. Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne, évêque de Paris* (Paris, 1880); Davy, *Les sermons universitaires*, pp. 121–4; R.J. Teske, 'William of Auvergne: An Overview', in Teske (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne* (Milwaukee, 2006), pp. 17–28; J. Berlioz, 'La voix de l'évêque', in *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (+1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 11–33; L. Smith, 'William of Auvergne and the Jews', in D. Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 107–17; T.B. de Mayo, 'The Demonology of William of Auvergne' (University of Arizona, PhD thesis, 2006), pp. 59, 64–7.
- 4 Details from R. Wood, 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall (d. after 1259)', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Dictionary of Philosophy*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/biographical/richard-rufus-of-cornwall-d-after-1259/v-1> (7 December 2017). Wood's chronology and attributions of works to Richard Rufus are disputed (see above, p. 225, n. 37).
- 5 Details from S. Macdonald, 'Grosseteste, Robert (c.1170–1253)', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/biographical/grosseteste-robert-c-1170-1253/v-1/sections/life-and-works-42192> (7 December 2017).
- 6 Richard Southern (*Robert Grosseteste*) argues against any links with Paris, but this is disputed by, for example, Nicole Schulman, 'Husband, Father, Bishop?', *Speculum*, 72 (1997), pp. 330–46, who cites new evidence from a cartulary of a church in Paris, Sainte-Opportune (which refers to a 'Robertus Grossum Capud' and a 'Robertus Grosse Teste' in 1224); and some link with Paris and William of Auvergne seems likely. A letter in 1239 from Grosseteste to William suggests he knew and liked him (Robert Grosseteste, *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, eds. F.A.C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto, 2010), pp. 270–1, no. 78). Grosseteste also followed developments in Paris in 1240, as his redesign of the Oxford curriculum with reference to that of Paris shows (*CUP*, i, no. 127, pp. 169–70). See also S.P. Marrone, *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste* (Princeton, 1983), esp. pp. 137–8, nn. 1–2.

Appendix D

Lateran IV statement of faith 1215¹

Canon 1: *De fide Catholica*

Firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur, quod unus solus est verus Deus, aeternus et immensus, omnipotens, incommutabilis, incomprehensibilis et ineffabilis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, tres quidem personae sed una essentia, substantia seu natura simplex omnino. Pater a nullo, Filius autem a solo Patre ac Spiritus sanctus ab utroque pariter, absque initio semper et fine. Pater generans, Filius nascens et Spiritus sanctus procedens, consubstantiales et coaequales, coomnipotentes et coaeterni, unum universorum principium, creator omnium invisibilium et visibilium, spiritualium et corporalium, qui sua omnipotenti virtute simul ab initio temporis, utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spiritualem et corporalem, angelicam videlicet et mundanam, ac deinde humanam quasi communem et spiritu et corpore constitutam. Diabolus enim et daemones alii a Deo quidem natura creati sunt boni, sed ipsi per se facti sunt mali. Homo vero diaboli suggestionem peccavit.

Haec sancta Trinitas secundum communem essentiam individua et secundum personales proprietates discreta, per Moysen et sanctos prophetas aliosque famulos suos, iuxta ordinatissimam dispositionem temporum, doctrinam humano generi tribuit salutarem. Et tandem unigenitus Dei Filius, Iesus Christus, a tota Trinitate communiter incarnatus, ex Maria semper virgine Spiritus sancti cooperatione conceptus, verus homo factus, ex anima rationali et humana carne compositus, una in duabus naturis persona, viam vitae manifestius demonstravit. Qui cum secundum divinitatem sit immortalis et impassibilis, idem ipse secundum humanitatem factus est passibilis et mortalis, quin etiam pro salute humani generis in ligno crucis passus et mortuus, descendit ad inferos, resurrexit a mortuis et ascendit in coelum; sed descendit in anima, resurrexit in carne ascenditque pariter in utroque, venturus in fine saeculi iudicare vivos et mortuos, et redditurus singulis secundum opera sua, tam reprobatis quam electis. Qui omnes cum suis propriis corporibus resurgent, quae nunc gestant, ut recipient secundum merita sua, sive bona fuerint sive mala, illi cum diabolo poenam perpetuam et isti cum Christi gloriam sempiternam.

Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Iesus Christus, cuius corpus et

sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit apostolis et eorum successoribus Iesus Christus. Sacramentum vero baptismi, quod ad invocationem individuae Trinitatis, videlicet Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, consecratur in aqua, tam parvulis quam adultis in forma ecclesiae a quocunque rite collatum, proficit ad salutem. Et si post susceptionem baptismi quisquam prolapsus fuerit in peccatum, per veram poenitentiam semper potest reparari. Non solum autem virgines et continentes, verum etiam coniugati, per fidem rectam et operationem bonam placentes Deo, ad aeternam merentur beatitudinem pervenire.

Canon 1: *On the Catholic faith*

We firmly believe and simply confess that there is only one true God, eternal and immeasurable, almighty, unchangeable, incomprehensible and ineffable, Father, Son and holy Spirit, three persons but absolutely one simple essence, substance or nature. The Father is from none, the Son from the Father alone, and the holy Spirit from both equally, eternally without beginning or end; the Father generating, the Son being born, and the holy Spirit proceeding; consubstantial and coequal, co-omnipotent and coeternal; one principle of all things, creator of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporeal; who by his almighty power at the beginning of time created from nothing both spiritual and corporeal creatures, that is to say angelic and earthly, and then created human beings composed as it were of both spirit and body in common. The devil and other demons were created by God naturally good, but they became evil by their own doing. Man, however, sinned at the prompting of the devil.

This holy Trinity, which is undivided according to its common essence but distinct according to the properties of its persons, gave the teaching of salvation to the human race through Moses and the holy prophets and his other servants, according to the most appropriate disposition of the times. Finally the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, who became incarnate by the action of the whole Trinity in common and was conceived from the ever virgin Mary through the cooperation of the holy Spirit, having become true man, composed of a rational soul and human flesh, one person in two natures, showed more clearly the way of life. Although he is immortal and unable to suffer according to his divinity, he was made capable of suffering and dying according to his humanity. Indeed, having suffered and died on the wood of the cross for the salvation of the human race, he descended to the underworld, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven. He descended in the soul, rose in the flesh, and ascended in both. He will come at the end of time to judge the living and the dead, to render to every person according to his works, both to the reprobate and to the elect. All of them will rise with their own bodies, which they now wear, so as to receive according to their deserts,

whether these be good or bad; for the latter perpetual punishment with the devil, for the former eternal glory with Christ.

There is indeed one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which nobody at all is saved, in which Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice. His body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread and wine having changed in substance, by God's power, into his body and blood, so that in order to achieve this mystery of unity we receive from God what he received from us. Nobody can effect this sacrament except a priest who has been properly ordained according to the Church's keys, which Jesus Christ himself gave to the apostles and their successors. But the sacrament of baptism is consecrated in water at the invocation of the undivided Trinity – namely Father, Son and holy Spirit – and brings salvation to both children and adults when it is correctly carried out by anyone in the form laid down by the Church. If someone falls into sin after having received baptism, he or she can always be restored through true penitence. For not only virgins and the continent but also married persons find favour with God by right faith and good actions and deserve to attain eternal blessedness.

Canon 2: *De errore abbatis Ioachim*

Damnamus ergo et reprobamus libellum sive tractatum, quem abbas Ioachim edidit contra magistrum Petrum Lombardum de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis, appellans ipsum haereticum et insanum, pro eo quod in suis dixit *Sententiis*: 'Quoniam quaedam summa res est Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, et illa non est generans neque genita nec procedens', unde asserit, quod ille non tam Trinitatem quam quaternitatem adstruebat in Deo, videlicet tres personae et illam communem essentiam quasi quartam, manifeste protestans, quod nulla res est quae sit Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, nec est essentia nec substantia nec natura, quamvis concedat quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sunt una essentia, una substantia, unaque natura; verum unitatem huiusmodi non veram et propriam, sed quasi collectivam et similitudinariam esse fatetur, quemadmodum dicuntur multi homines unus populus, et multi fideles una ecclesia, iuxta illud: *Multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una*, et *Qui adhaeret Deo unus spiritus est cum illo*; item *Qui plantat et qui rigat unus sunt*, et omnes *unum corpus sumus in Christo*; rursus in libro Regum: *Populus meus et populus tuus unum sunt*. Ad hanc autem sententiam adstruendam, illud potissimum verbum inducit, quod Christus de fidelibus inquit in evangelio: *Volo, Pater, ut sint unum in nobis, sicut et nos unus sumus, ut sint consummati in unum*. Non enim, ut ait, fideles Christi sunt unum, id est una quaedam res quae communis sit omnibus, hic modo sunt unum, id est una ecclesia propter catholicae fidei unitatem et tandem unum regnum propter unionem indissolubilis caritatis. Quemadmodum in canonica Ioannis epistola legitur: *Quia tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in coelo, Pater, et Verbum et Spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt*; statimque subiungit: *Et tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua et sanguis, et tres unum sunt*, sicut in quibusdam codicibus invenitur.

Nos autem sacro et universali concilio approbante, credimus et confitemur cum Petro, quod una quaedam summa res est, incomprehensibilis quidem et ineffabilis, quae veraciter est Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, tres simul personae ac sigillatim quaelibet earundem, et ideo in Deo Trinitas est solummodo non quaternitas, quia quaelibet trium personarum est illa res, videlicet substantia, essentia seu natura divina, quae sola est universorum principium, praeter quod aliud inveniri non potest, et illa res non est generans, neque genita, nec procedens, sed est Pater qui generat, Filius qui gignitur et Spiritus sanctus qui procedit, ut distinctiones sint in personis et unitas in natura. Licet igitur alius sit Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus sanctus, non tamen aliud, sed id quod est Pater, est Filius et Spiritus sanctus, idem omnino, ut secundum orthodoxam et catholicam fidem consubstantiales esse credantur. Pater enim ab aeterno Filium generando, suam substantiam ei dedit, iuxta quod ipse testatur: *Pater quod dedit mihi, maius est omnibus*, ac dici non potest, quod partem substantiae suae illi dederit et partem ipse sibi retinuerit, cum substantia Patris indivisibilis sit, utpote simplex omnino; sed nec dici potest, quod Pater in Filium transtulerit suam substantiam generando, quasi sic dederit eam Filio, quod non retinuerit ipsam sibi, alio quin desiisset esse substantia. Patet ergo, quod sine ulla diminutione, Filius nascendo substantiam Patris accepit, et ita Pater et Filius habent eandem substantiam, et sic eadem res est Pater et Filius necnon et Spiritus sanctus, ab utroque procedens.

Cum ergo Veritas pro fidelibus suis ad Patrem orat: volo, inquit, ut ipsi *sint unum in nobis, sicut et nos unum sumus*, hoc nomen, *unum*, pro fidelibus quidem accipitur, ut intelligatur unio caritatis in gratia; pro personis vero divinis, ut attendatur identitatis in natura unitas, quemadmodum Veritas alibi ait: *Estote perfecti sicut et Pater vester coelestis perfectus est*, ac si diceret manifestius: *Estote perfecti perfectione gratiae, sicut Pater vester coelestis perfectus est perfectione naturae*, utraque videlicet suo modo, quia inter creatorem et creaturam non potest tanta similitudo notari, quin inter eos maior sit dissimilitudo notanda. Si quis igitur sententiam sive doctrinam praefati Ioachim in hac parte defendere vel approbare praesumpserit, tamquam haereticus ab omnibus confutetur. In nullo tamen propter hoc Florensi monasterio, cuius ipse Ioachim exstitit institutor, volumus derogari, quoniam ibi et regularis institutio est et observantia salutaris, maxime cum ipse Ioachim omnia scripta sua nobis assignari mandaverit, apostolicae sedis iudicio approbanda seu etiam corrigenda, dictans epistolam, cui propria manu subscripsit, in qua firmiter confitetur, se illam fidem tenere, quam Romana tenet ecclesia, quae cunctorum fidelium, disponente Domino, mater est et magistra.

Reprobamus etiam et damnamus perversissimum dogma impii Almarici, cuius mentem sic pater mendacii excaecavit, ut eius doctrina non tam haeretica censenda sit, quam insana.

Canon 2: On the error of abbot Joachim

We therefore condemn and reprove that small book or treatise which abbot Joachim published against master Peter Lombard concerning the unity or essence of the Trinity, in which he calls Peter Lombard a heretic and a madman because

he said in his *Sentences*, 'For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed'. He asserts from this that Peter Lombard ascribes to God not so much a Trinity as a quaternity, that is to say three persons and a common essence as if this were a fourth person. Abbot Joachim clearly protests that there does not exist any reality which is the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit – neither an essence nor a substance nor a nature – although he concedes that the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit are one essence, one substance and one nature. He professes, however, that such a unity is not true and proper but rather collective and analogous, in the way that many persons are said to be one people and many faithful one church, according to that saying: *Of the multitude of believers there was one heart and one mind*, and *Whoever adheres to God is one spirit* with him; again *He who plants and he who waters are one*, and all of us are *one body in Christ*; and again in the book of Kings, *My people and your people are one*. In support of this opinion he especially uses the saying which Christ uttered in the gospel concerning the faithful: I wish, Father, *that they may be one in us*, just as *we are one*, so that *they may be made perfect in one*. For, he says, Christ's faithful are not one in the sense of a single reality which is common to all. They are one only in this sense, that they form one church through the unity of the catholic faith, and finally one kingdom through a union of indissoluble charity. Thus we read in the canonical letter of John: *For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father and the Word and the holy Spirit, and these three are one*; and he immediately adds, *And the three that bear witness on earth are the spirit, water and blood, and the three are one*, according to some manuscripts.

We, however, with the approval of this sacred and universal council, believe and confess with Peter Lombard that there exists a certain supreme reality, incomprehensible and ineffable, which truly is the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit, the three persons together and each one of them separately. Therefore, in God there is only a Trinity, not a quaternity, since each of the three persons is that reality – that is to say substance, essence or divine nature – which alone is the principle of all things, besides which no other principle can be found. This reality neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds; the Father begets, the Son is begotten and the holy Spirit proceeds. Thus there is a distinction of persons but a unity of nature. Although therefore the Father is one person, the Son another person and the holy Spirit another person, they are not different realities, but rather that which is the Father is the Son and the holy Spirit, altogether the same; thus according to the orthodox and catholic faith they are believed to be consubstantial. For the Father, in begetting the Son from eternity, gave him his substance, as he himself testifies: *What the Father gave me is greater than all*. It cannot be said that the Father gave him part of his substance and kept part for himself, since the Father's substance is indivisible, inasmuch as it is altogether simple. Nor can it be said that the Father transferred his substance to the Son, in the act of begetting, as if he gave it to the Son in such a way that he did not retain it for himself; for otherwise he would have ceased to be substance. It is therefore clear that, in being begotten, the Son received the Father's substance without it being diminished in any way, and

thus the Father and the Son have the same substance. Thus the Father and the Son and also the holy Spirit proceeding from both are the same reality.

When, therefore, the Truth prays to the Father for those faithful to him, saying I wish that *they may be one in us just as we are one*, this word *one* means for the faithful a union of love in grace, and for the divine persons a unity of identity in nature, as the Truth says elsewhere, *You must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect*, as if he were to say more plainly, *You must be perfect* in the perfection of grace, *just as your Father is perfect* in the perfection that is his by nature, each in his own way. For between creator and creature there can be noted no similarity so great that a greater dissimilarity cannot be seen between them. If anyone therefore ventures to defend or approve the opinion or doctrine of the aforesaid Joachim on this matter, let him be refuted by all as a heretic. By this, however, we do not intend anything to the detriment of the monastery of Fiore, which Joachim founded, because there both the instruction is according to rule and the observance is healthy; especially since Joachim ordered all his writings to be handed over to us, to be approved or corrected according to the judgment of the apostolic see. He dictated a letter, which he signed with his own hand, in which he firmly confesses that he holds the faith held by the Roman church, which is by God's plan the mother and mistress of all the faithful.

We also reject and condemn that most perverse doctrine of the impious Amalric, whose mind the father of lies blinded to such an extent that his teaching is to be regarded as mad more than as heretical.

Note

- 1 *Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 230–3.

Appendix E

Angels, Lateran IV and the condemnation

This appendix offers a case study on the theme of angels in canon one of Lateran IV and the condemnation. Identification of the coverage of angels in both supports the relationship between the two, and illustrates the way that the condemnation provides a more detailed exposition of the principles enshrined in Lateran IV. It also illustrates the multiple influences underlying the condemnation.

Angels had been part of theological discussions from the twelfth century, with their position cemented by Peter Lombard's extensive coverage in his *Sententiae*. This fascination continued into the thirteenth century.¹ But the reasons underlying the problems they caused can be traced to different sources – some 'primary', arising directly from scriptural, theological and philosophical references (or indeed lack of reference) to them; some 'secondary', from their use by others, such as dualists; but all of them underlying thirteenth-century debate. First, there was the biblical problem of their omission from the creation story, which, coupled with their manifest existence in both Old and New Testaments, left scope for them to acquire an uncreated, independent status. This opened the door to dualism.² Second, an issue, again biblical in origin, was the problem posed by their particular role. Origen, in particular, was believed to have held that they pre-existed time and were the uncreated wisdom of God referred to in Ecclesiasticus, 'Wisdom hath been created before all things' [Ecclus. i:1,4].³ Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* on Peter Lombard's discussion here is particularly illuminating and merits full citation:

'Is understood ... [Wisdom is understood to refer to angelic nature].' Against, the *Glossa* on this [Ecclus. i:4]: '[Wisdom] created in respect of humanity ... was predestined to be incarnated for the human race's salvation. But Christ, because of the unity of the person, is called both born and created'.

'Often life ... [Wisdom is often taken to refer to angelic nature, often called life in Scripture]' ... the angel is called life, wisdom, light, and such like, as is clear from Augustine, *Super Genesim*. 'Life', because he dwells in the God of life; 'wisdom', because he dwells in uncreated wisdom; 'light', for he shares the eternal light ...

'Was made... [Nothing was made before heaven and earth].' Isidore, in ... *De Trinitate* [*Sententiae*, i, 10]: 'There are two things among creatures to

whom the vicissitude of times do not apply: angels, because they dwell in the unchangeable truth; or unformed matter ... Time therefore pertains not to those creatures above the heavens, but below heaven' ...

'There was [an eternal and changeless] time [before the world].' Augustine, xi [xii] *De civitate Dei*, Chapter 15: 'There were always angels, because they were for all time. For where no creature [exists], by whose changeable movements times are accomplished, times cannot exist at all. Nor therefore are they coeternal with the Creator: for time, since it runs by change, cannot be coeternal with immutable eternity'.⁴

Alexander's commentary shows Ecclesiasticus' reference to 'created' was problematic. Unless it was glossed, it implied that Christ, one of the uncreated Trinity, could not be wisdom, leaving this role entirely for angels, thereby giving them the status of having been always with God and being before time (Ecclus. i:1). It also demonstrates the heavy reliance of theologians such as Alexander, especially on Augustine, but also on other Latin authorities.

A third angelic problem, again originating in the Bible, concerned the empyrean heaven. Medieval theologians generally believed the Bible taught that this was corporeal. Angels, being incorporeal, should not live in a corporeal place. There were numerous discussions on the nature of the empyrean heaven and of angels in the period preceding and around the condemnation. However, while such discussions had biblical roots, they also had wider 'scientific' antecedents in Plato and earlier writers, with Greek, Christian, Jewish and Arab philosophers, theologians, natural scientists and geographers fascinated by the movement and nature of the heavens in all their permutations. This debate continued with increasing sophistication as a result of the newly translated Aristotelian material from the 1150s onwards. Such texts also added complexity to existing debates on issues such as how bodies and spirits move in time and space.⁵ Thus, in his commentary on the *Sententiae*, Albertus Magnus cited the Church Fathers and the Bible, but also, without necessarily agreeing with it, Aristotle's *Physics*, among arguments on angelic existence: if something, such as hydromel, composed of honey and water, consisted of two things, and if one of them existed separately, then the other must do so as well. Since substances were made up of the corporeal and incorporeal, and the corporeal existed separately, so must the incorporeal i.e. angels. Albertus cited Aristotle's *De caelo et mundo* [I.3] for the argument that heaven is a body but immortal – so by how much more must angels, being incorporeal, be immortal by nature. He also referred to commentators on Aristotle, such as al-Ghazālī and Maimonides, as well as the *Liber de causis*.⁶

A further strand within discussions on how to interpret biblical references to angels came, directly and indirectly, from Neoplatonism, sometimes confused with, or combined with, Aristotle's original views. The *Liber de causis* provides especially salient evidence here. In particular, while it identified the First Cause as the sole creative force, the role assigned to Intelligence and the intelligences went beyond Christian doctrine in three – complementary – respects. For the First Cause, creation was through Intelligence as intermediary ('mediante intelligentia').

Moreover, the sub-creative powers given to the intelligences were problematic, since some medieval theologians identified these with Christian angels.⁷ Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, and the subsequent commentaries, accordingly went to some lengths to demonstrate that angels (and others, such as Pharaoh's magicians), had no creative powers. Finally, the argument that Intelligence and the intelligences were co-eternal with the First Cause was problematic (unless Intelligence was equated with Christ, which raised issues over other aspects of its role and that of the intelligences subsumed under it).

The sharpest exposition of these issues comes from Albertus Magnus' commentary on the *Sententiae*. According to his own summary: 'philosophers say that angels are the substances which move to being [the substances] of elements and elemental things, and flow over being and the movement of the orbs; therefore they must be before the elements and elemental things and orbs, and must have been created before them'. He noted that many believed, wrongly, that God created the world through the angels, and questioned 'whether we may call angelic substances those separated substances which the philosophers call intelligences, as some contentiously presume to defend'. Albertus accused al-Ghazālī, Avicenna, Maimonides and philosophers generally of erring by making this equation. Returning later to this critique, he stated: 'it seems through that proposition in the *Liber de Causis* that an intelligence is full of forms; therefore it seems the same would be the case with angels, although according to our interpretation ('intentio') an intelligence is not an angel'.⁸

These strands of influence could all be described as 'primary', directly creating dilemmas for Catholic doctrine. But they had secondary consequences through their impact on other religions and on heresies, notably in both Languedoc and Bosnia, themselves of deep concern. Dualism was still very much a live issue. So also was Judaism, with Maimonides' equation of angels with intelligences probably known in Paris by the 1240s, together with the condemnation of the Talmud in Paris in the early 1240s. The potentially pernicious threat from both these areas in respect of angels is clear. The dualist elevation of the evil angel to the status of a god with creative powers, as expounded in the *Liber de duobus principiis*, was wholly unacceptable to Catholic doctrine. Angels and their role had become a key doctrinal issue in its refutation. For Jews, while the doctrinal accusations against the Talmud in the 1240 trial mainly concerned subjects such as Christology and the Virgin Mary, one at least touched on angels – or rather, demons. On a Talmudic statement that Adam begat ghosts and demons, the Jewish response – as set out in the Hebrew narrative, the *Disputation* of Yehiel ben Joseph of Paris (the main Jewish spokesman) – argued that Genesis' failure to mention their creation supported this position:

There are many beings that have a body and soul ... such as those called *Lutin* (Goblin) ... Those they call *Piash* [?] from whom did they descend? There is no problem with those who were created without a body ... However, those that were completed with both body and soul ... from whom did they derive? Clearly, Lilith came and lay with him [Adam] while he was unaware, since

she had no substance, for she had no body. And when he discharged into her the seed, she was created [with substance: a body] at the outset. And from her came the same ghosts, he-demons, and she-demons, as it says, 'When Adam was one hundred and thirty years he became a father in his likeness, according to his image' [Gen. v:3].⁹

This passage could be seen as undermining Christian beliefs concerning both the creation story and angels.

It is thus clear both that angels were important elements of thirteenth-century theology, and that they caused problems. Their creation, relationship to God (including possible infringement on his omnipotence), role and powers, and link to explanations for good and evil, were all issues needing clarification. Positioned between God and humans, they illuminated issues such as humanity's vision of God, Adam's fall, human freewill and God's gifts of grace, given to both angels and humankind. The debates they triggered were coloured by numerous factors, whether inherent in Christianity or arising from philosophical texts, with a resultant amalgam which was hard even for contemporaries to separate into its component parts. Their problematic status and nature were intensified by contemporary real or apparent threats, such as heresy and Judaism.

Angels pervade Lateran IV's initial statement. This began by affirming the existence of one sole God, who 'made from nothing creatures both spiritual and corporeal, angelic ... and mundane ...'. It continued with explicit reference to the devil: 'The devil and the other demons were indeed created by God good by nature but became bad through themselves; man, however, sinned at the suggestion of the devil'. Thus, the issue of creation – God's sole role in this, explicitly including his creation of angels, and the initially good nature of all angels – were made the centrepiece of Catholic doctrine. The references to devils and angels demonstrate that both were seen as key to proper Catholic interpretation in the face of perceived heresies such as dualism. They formed a marked feature of Lateran IV and, as such, stand in patent contrast to previous conciliar declarations.¹⁰

While not all the condemnation's articles refer explicitly to angels, they are present – either explicitly or lurking, so to speak, in the wings – in all except articles two and three (on the Trinity, where they would be inappropriate, and where they are equally absent from Lateran IV's text). This is not to suggest that the condemnation's whole, or even main, focus is on angels. Like Lateran IV, however, they provide an important underlying and coherent theme.

Article one, the beatific vision, includes angels alongside humans. Lateran IV referred to God's incomprehensible and ineffable nature, but not explicitly to angels (who shared with humans the ability to see and to know but not to comprehend God). However, the need to affirm vision for both groups necessitated their inclusion in article one – both were threatened by Greek 'negative' theology and Aristotelian theories on knowledge and vision. By 1241/4, the ability to *see* God, not his unknowability, had become a major issue for both.

Angels are also visible in article four (the empyrean heaven), in which the offending proposition locates them while expelling any prospective human

occupants. The genesis for this belief is obscure. But, despite initial appearances, one candidate, or at least a contributory factor, is that the problem was angelic as much as human, resulting from the differing natures of the two groups. There are two potential implications here. First, given that medieval theologians generally believed that the Bible stated the empyrean heaven was corporeal and angels were incorporeal, article four was, in its origins anyway, partially 'home-grown'. Second, its omission from the start of the 1215 statement of faith – where it would logically fit as being the place where the first creatures were created, according to the creation story outlined there – could simply be because the specific issue causing one or more theologians sufficient concern for its inclusion in 1241/4 (perhaps, the full implications of corporeality, brought into sharper focus by discussion in the new Aristotelian texts) had not yet triggered real alarm.¹¹

Article five, on whether the evil angel was created bad, is more straightforward in two respects. Angels are, self-evidently, the main issue (although with the whole issue of good, evil and freewill underneath). It also represents a crucial early element in the creation story for both the condemnation and Lateran IV (the obvious overlap with article ten being explained by the focus there on humanity's fall as against Satan's creation and turn to evil).¹² As regards derivation, its origin was clearly biblical and 'home-grown', although against a backdrop of dualism (whether Manichaean or later Cathar). Discussions of this subject show mixed influences, many of them patristic. Setting the agenda for subsequent discussion, Peter Lombard cited Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*:

Not without cause may it be held that the devil fell from the very beginning of time or of his existence, and never stood in the truth. From this, some think that the devil was not disposed to wickedness by his free choice, but that he was created [in a state of] wickedness, albeit by God, according to ... Job, who says 'He is the beginning of God's work, which God made so that he might be mocked by his angels'.¹³

Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* followed similar lines to Peter Lombard, with a typical dilemma encapsulated in a quotation, this time from Anselm of Canterbury:

Either his [Satan's] own will was good or bad. If good, how did he fall from so great good because of it? But if bad, either it was something or nothing. If something, either from God or from it/him itself: which is against that saying of the Apostle [1.Cor. iv:7]: 'What do you have which you have not received?' But if nothing, how was he damned so gravely on account of nothing.¹⁴

These passages from Peter Lombard and Alexander demonstrate the moral core of the issue, but also its potential implications – Alexander's arguments also echo the kind of argumentation in the dualist *Liber de duobus principiis*: if evil did not exist, how could angels have chosen it?

Albertus Magnus' discussion was characteristically complex and wide-ranging. In his commentary on the *Sententiae*, he referred to Aristotle's argument that an intellect is always right, and angels are only moved by the intellect – hence angels could not fall through sin. However, his references to new Aristotelian and related texts on the specific issue in article five are noticeably fewer than elsewhere in his commentary. Indeed, on the question whether all angels were created in grace or in simple natural goodness, he stated that he would proceed mainly through the authorities, since 'our reasoning around the state of angels is lacking ('circum statum angeli deficit nostra ratio')'.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Albertus' arguments, while not new, have a more contemporary ring to them, both Neoplatonic and Aristotelian. Once again, although dualists were not explicitly his focus, their presence is tangible. Moreover, their presence in this context is more explicit elsewhere. William of Auvergne's sustained attack on them is particularly revealing, dominating, and dictating, his major exposition on the creation of the evil angel as good.¹⁶

Given the dualists' own use of Aristotelian principles to support their doctrine, the new texts may thus well have indirectly contributed to the inclusion of the issue in both the condemnation and Lateran IV. However, the main factor behind both was the need to tackle an intractable moral conundrum and combat a dualism based on this, coupled with the chronological placement of angels in the creation story and the fall.

The focus of article six, as for article five, is plainly angelic, but for article six their encroachment on God's preeminence was clearly the underlying issue. While angelic location as such does not form a sequential part of the creation story, it fits this part of the account as it relates only to angels, the first creations, and thus fleshes out the role of the first created beings. Moreover, any enlargement of their role potentially impinged on God's unique omnipresence and limitlessness – concepts implicit in Lateran IV's emphasis on God's all-powerful being.¹⁷ Peter Lombard contrasted a creature 'bounded by the certain limits of its own nature', with that of the Holy Spirit, 'who does not have a circumscribed and determined power, who is always in all things and everywhere ...'. Alexander of Hales' discussion followed similar lines, including the mechanics of angelic movement, relying on authorities such as John Damascene for his theological and scientific arguments. Both these accounts avoided giving angels any God-like powers of omnipresence, despite their incorporeality and special roles. Gueric of St.-Quentin differentiated between different levels of angels, arguing that the highest level could operate in more than one place simultaneously if so directed by God.¹⁸

Up to this point, the arguments on this particular issue appear to have derived primarily from discussion by the Church Fathers. Albertus Magnus, however, brought new perspectives. After a long technical discussion in his commentary on the *Sententiae* on issues such as the meaning of 'place' and the components and temporal nature of angelic locomotion, Albertus noted numerous different views on angelic movement, including those of Maimonides and other Jews, with some philosophers arguing that angels could be at the same time in many, or even

all, places – a view Albertus stated was heresy since it contradicted the saints. Albertus concluded that no two views on angelic movement were identical.¹⁹

It is thus clear that the debate on article six was rooted in patristic authority, with the position identified as erroneous in the condemnation perhaps stemming from distinctions between tiers of angels, as discussed by Gueric of St.-Quentin. However, it had now been sharpened by the new Aristotelian material, as well as by Arab and Jewish works. Additional sensitivity on angelic powers may have resulted from these texts, as well as from increasing concern over dualism. But, as with so many of the articles, the result seems to be a combination of influences – biblical exegesis, Neoplatonic ideas on angels, heresies, with the new learning increasing the toxicity of the mixture for Catholic theology – and hence, perhaps, unlike for Lateran IV, requiring its explicit inclusion in the condemnation.

Article seven is one of the most complex for any assessment of the role of angels within the condemnation. The possibility is inherent in the first of three propositions on eternal truths which are not God in Alexander of Hales' *Quaestio, About the eternal truth of things*. Alexander cited Augustine, *De libero arbitrio*, for the equation of mathematical truths with eternal truths, i.e. Platonic ideas/forms. The angelic connection resulted from this identification, with the subsequent equation of ideas/forms with angels deriving from Neoplatonism.²⁰ Concern in this area went back a long way, but Albertus Magnus, taking his lead from Boethius, most starkly equated mathematical concepts or truths with Platonic ideas. Moreover, while both Peter Lombard, in his *Sententiae*, and Alexander of Hales, in his *Glossa*, were already concerned over Plato's three uncreated principles, Albertus Magnus' commentary on the *Sententiae* went further in arguing that Plato undoubtedly erred in how he posited exemplars.²¹ Albertus frequently referred to intelligences as full of forms (or ideas), thus correlating the two; he also expressed extreme concern at the identification of intelligences with angels made by many Arab and Jewish philosophers.²²

Thus, although only implicit in article seven, the question of angels was clearly not far below the surface. Moreover, their presence can be linked to concern over the possible angelic role in creation, and thus – just as it had done for Lateran IV – it fits a loose creation chronology for this part of the condemnation. This link is also suggested by Alexander's inclusion of the question on eternal truths in his *Quaestiones universitatem*, a series of discussions primarily on the world's creation and duration. While Alexander noted the question was somewhat misplaced, the individual who originally posed it apparently thought it fitted the context of those discussions.²³ The extrapolation of Platonic or Neoplatonic ideas, and hence truths, to angels is only one of the issues underlying article seven. But it arguably gave the article immediacy and real 'teeth', given concerns on angels generally in respect of creative powers and other possible usurpations of divinity, many raised by Neoplatonism and perhaps exacerbated between 1215 and 1241/4 by the increasing use of works such as the *Liber de causis* and those by Avicenna and other Arab, as well as Jewish, philosophers.

Article eight makes sense sequentially in both the condemnation and Lateran IV. The creation of the physical world falls logically after articles that concern

God's supreme powers and the existence of eternal truth.²⁴ However, while Lateran IV explicitly includes angels within God's creation, their appearance in article eight is less obvious – the main focus of the article is patently on Aristotelian and other theories on the eternity of the world, its creation and the creation of time. Nevertheless, given the backdrop of concerns over angelic creation (in particular over the notion that they themselves were not created, but creators), their presence must represent an underlying strand. There were numerous discussions on whether angels were created in time or before time, with implications for whether there was a first moment of time. Peter Lombard demonstrated the long-standing difficulties in this issue. He noted Jerome's remark on eternities passing during which angels served God without measures of time – some people, he claimed, had interpreted this to mean that, although 'worldly time began with the world' there was an 'eternal and changeless time before the world'.²⁵ Alexander of Hales' *Glossa* showed similar concerns, with ambivalent quotations from both Isidore and Augustine implying that angels existed before time and had always existed.²⁶ Thus, although arguments in later works, such as Albertus Magnus' commentary on the *Sententiae* and Alexander's *Quaestiones universitatem*, tended to look more at Aristotle's scientific arguments, Albertus's concern over the equation of angels with intelligences or ideas (with creative powers) implies that, even in the 1240s, angels were bound up in article eight, albeit as associated doctrinal perils – just as they were more obviously, and benignly, included in the creation story in 1215.

Angels are, again, not explicitly invoked in article nine, which appears primarily focussed on humans, perhaps concerned with predestination and the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius. However, while the riposte appears Augustinian (with references to pre-selection and preordaining), one explanation for the banned proposition probably lies, at least partly, in Peter Lombard's adoption of the pseudo-Dionysian concept of angelic hierarchy (which linked rewards and natural capacities). This was a much-debated passage of the *Sententiae*, with thirteenth-century theologians concerned over applying the same sort of connection to humans.²⁷ Peter Lombard argued that God gave gifts to angels unequally – those given greater natural goods would later transcend the rest through the gifts of grace.²⁸ However, he was less clear about humans. Guerric of St.-Quentin also discussed the point, again referring to angels – greater capacity in respect of substance and intellect resulted in greater capacity in respect of reward of substance.²⁹ Subsequently, and writing shortly after the condemnation, Albertus Magnus and Bonaventure explicitly treated angels and humans differently, and they both felt the need to justify such a distinction. In a revealing passage, Albertus argued that, generally, grace was not proportionate to nature, but angels were an exception 'because they were created in grace'.³⁰

It is therefore clear that angels, however implicit, were a key element in article nine, figuring in many twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts on natural gifts, grace and glory, with potentially unacceptable implications for humankind. The idea of a Neoplatonic predetermined hierarchy where the level of grace given was linked to natural goods, even though these came from God, undermined the

role both of God in predestination and of Christ as saviour, and left the church no real function. Moreover, it can be linked with article ten, the fall from grace, explaining its position in the condemnation – before Adam fell, and had he not fallen, his natural gifts, coupled with grace, would have ensured his glory.³¹ It thus provides a chronological progression in the creation story from God, through angels, to humans – the sequence adopted in both the condemnation and Lateran IV.

Article ten is important in its own right, with its focus on humanity's creation and the ability to stand firm but, like the evil angel, not to profit. However, it involves some repetition with article five on angels being created good. Many texts therefore discussed both issues together, with the role of the evil angel attracting at least as much attention as that of Adam. Indeed, Peter Lombard used the fact that Adam and Eve did not immediately sin to support his position on a brief delay between Satan's creation and fall. He explicitly linked Satan's fall with that of Adam, when he stated that Satan 'promised equality with God to himself and killed his own self, which is called "man" in the Gospel. And he did not "stand in the truth" because he was never in it, but he committed apostasy "from the beginning" of time, that is, from the moment of the making of man, whom through envy he cast into death and seduced by deceit'. A similar connection was made by Alexander of Hales, when he argued in his *Glossa*: 'If someone says that there was not a delay before the fall, the response should be according to authority, because it is understood about the devil when he was a serpent. But this was when he had been ordained to suggest sin to man, and thus it is not said about the first sin'.³² This suggests Peter Lombard and Alexander connected the devil's fall with Adam's, as well as earlier. It fits the separation of articles five and ten, but also the importance of angelic action to Adam's fall.

Article ten marks the end of the historical account of creation with the fall of both angels and humans. Its importance and derivation mirrors that of article five – both covered fundamental theological problems, with the need to combat dualist influence probably providing strong motivation for the topic's inclusion in both Lateran IV and the condemnation, albeit perhaps more directly for article five.

Angels – along with creation – thus comprise an important sub-text running throughout articles four to ten, just as they had done in Lateran IV's statement of faith. The exact ordering of the articles varies between manuscripts. However, the same underlying theme applies – the main difference concerns whether eternal truths and the world's creation come before or after the angels' fall and the empyrean heaven – but the underlying connections remain. Thus, according to the *CUP*'s ordering, the sequence starts with article four, the empyrean heaven, where the issue appears to be as much angelic as human. Articles five and six concentrate on angels, their fall and alleged omnipresence, followed by article seven, eternal truths which are not God, where the evidence that angels are part of the underlying agenda, and are linked to creation, is compelling. These three articles pick up major issues relevant to God's power and nature in respect of angels, the first beings created. Article seven leads naturally into article eight, creation, where angels are implicit, given the putative role assigned to them as creators before

time began. The final two articles, while still with an angelic focus, move to look more directly at issues which also involved humans.³³

Whatever the outside pressures on doctrine, it is clear that thirteenth-century Parisian theologians struggled with numerous fundamental issues of angelology in their own right, arising from the Bible and their own authorities, but also often influenced by the Greek philosophers, together with Arab and Jewish interpretations. How a wholly good God could create creatures who could turn to evil is a problem that lies at the heart of Christianity, irrespective of philosophy; and the complexity and difficulty of the argumentation illustrate this.

As for why angels had so strong a presence in a condemnation at this particular time, and, indeed, in Lateran IV earlier, it is clear that aberrant views on them posed two major contemporary risks to Catholic faith. First was dualism. For Peter Lombard, this may have been partly historic, with Augustine's works ensuring its presence; but for thirteenth-century theologians, perhaps particularly the Dominicans, it was a live and pressing issue. Second was the insidious belief in angels as intelligences originating in Neoplatonism (albeit confused with Aristotelianism because of the misattribution of the *Liber de causis*). This was an escalating issue made more seductive through both the Greek philosophers and their Arab commentators, and, intriguingly, through a Jewish strand of thought, visible particularly in Maimonides. Both risks – dualism and Neoplatonism – would have been present in 1215 as well as 1241/4, although in 1215 concerns over the new Aristotelian texts would have been less focussed than by the 1240s. In reflecting Lateran IV's priorities, the condemnation also reflected its angelic theme, and although some of the specific concerns in the 1240s went beyond those of 1215, the underlying position and nature of the problem remained the same. Comparison of the explicit and implicit references to angels in the condemnation with those in Lateran IV illustrates how the mixture of influences behind its different articles, and indeed within the individual articles, while rooted in similar and manifold sources, had developed. And it provides compelling evidence for the link between Lateran IV and condemnation.

Notes

The names of authors of primary works have been standardised for consistency in both the endnotes and the bibliography.

- 1 Angels fascinated both medieval scholars and lay people. Good angels acted as individual guardians, God's messengers and servants. Evil angels tempted humans, contributing to their fall. Twelfth-century theologians (such as Hugh of St. Victor, *The Didascalicon*, trans. J. Taylor (New York, 1961), pp. 156, 227–8, n. 3) placed angels within Genesis' creation account. Peter Lombard's influence was crucial – his exhaustive treatment in the *Sententiae*, coupled with their integration within the *Sententiae*'s other main topics, ensured angelology was put firmly on the agenda (M.L. Colish, 'Early Scholastic Angelology', in Colish (ed.), *Studies in Scholasticism* (Ashgate, 2006), p. 91). Twelfth-century debates included how Genesis should be read, examination of Neoplatonic accounts, similarities between Genesis and Plato's *Timaeus*, and angels as created beings or co-creators. Interest in angels decreased later in the twelfth

- century but flourished again in the thirteenth – for example, Bonaventure referred to ‘plures ... philosophi’ discussing angelic issues (D. Keck, *Angels and Angelology* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 18–9). Of the 572 questions in Douai, MS 434, over seventeen percent directly discussed angels (Glorieux, ‘Les 572 questions’, pp. 123–52, 225–67). Good angels were exemplars for humans – studying them allowed humans better to understand themselves and their relationship to God.
- 2 Paul Quay (‘Angels and Demons’, *Theological Studies*, 45 (1981), pp. 42–3) argues that almost all Albigenian and Cathar teachings before Lateran IV were made in terms of angels or demons. Even if such teachings were partially systematised by Catholic theologians, the threat of independent angelic status was inevitable, given their lack of explicit biblical creation.
 - 3 Colish, ‘Early Scholastic Angelology’, p. 85.
 - 4 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 2, pp. 16–8.
 - 5 For the argument that innovations in angelology in the thirteenth century appear to have resulted partly from the new Aristotelian material which led to a more systematic approach to the subject, including the place of angels in creation, see C. Muessig, ‘Heaven, Earth and the Angels’, in C. Muessig and A. Putter (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), p. 61.
 - 6 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.1, 3.2–3, 3.15 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 60–1, 63–6, 89.
 - 7 This connection went back at least to Augustine, *De civitate Dei* [Concerning the City of God against the Pagans], trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003), p. 504), xii, 25, although he equated angels with Plato’s lesser gods (the Neoplatonic henads, replaced by intelligences in the *Liber de causis*).
 - 8 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 2.1, 3.3, 3.15 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 44, 64–6, 92.
 - 9 J. Friedman, J.C. Hoff and R. Chazan, *The Trial of the Talmud* (Toronto, 2012), pp. 164–5.
 - 10 The need to counter dualism is further illustrated by Jacques de Vitry’s attempts to discredit dualist angelology – his sermons made clear that angels were inferior to God and that the devil caused humankind’s fall, as specified in Lateran IV (Muessig, ‘Heaven, Earth and the Angels’, p. 61).
 - 11 Some manuscripts move article four down the list, but do not affect its angelic roots.
 - 12 In some manuscripts, creation comes before the angelic fall, equally consistent with creation chronology.
 - 13 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.5, p. 15; Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* (*On Genesis*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 2002), p. 443. The passage, Job xl, 19 (or Job xl, 14) is in the old Greek translation and quoted by Origen (in his commentary on John’s Gospel), but I have not found it in the Vulgate or Septuagint.
 - 14 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 5, p. 46; Anselm, *De casu diaboli* (*The Major Works*), eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008), pp. 204–5.
 - 15 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 5.1, 3.12 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 110–1, 82–5.
 - 16 William of Auvergne, *Universe of Creatures*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998), pp. 31–60.
 - 17 Many medieval accounts associated Satan’s fall with his envy of God and pride in his own status. Article six could therefore be implicitly connected to article five in exemplifying angelic arrogance and its consequences.
 - 18 Lombard, *Sentences*, i, 37.1, p. 203; Alexander, *Glossa*, i, 37, pp. 364–5; Guerric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, pp. 57, 289.
 - 19 Albertus, *In I Sent.*, 37.24 (Borgnet, xxvi), pp. 262–6.
 - 20 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 215–8, 240–3 (reference to *De libero arbitrio* corrected from *Soliloquies* in editorial footnote).
 - 21 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 1.3–5 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 11–19.
 - 22 For example, op.cit., 3.2–3, 15, pp. 61–6, 92.
 - 23 Alexander, *Quaestiones universitatem*, pp. 240–3, noted, in one version, that it was raised ‘ex incidenti’ and would fit better with questions on truth.

- 24 Some manuscripts put the angelic creation after the world's creation, but the creation story is sufficiently flexible to accommodate both variations.
- 25 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 1.1–2.3, pp. 3–10.
- 26 Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 1–2, pp. 1–18.
- 27 Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Celestial Hierarchy (The Complete Works)*, trans. C. Luibheid (New York, 1987), p. 160: 'all the heavenly powers hold as a common possession an inferior or superior capacity to conform to the divine and to enter into communion with the light coming from God'.
- 28 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.2, p. 13.
- 29 Gueric, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, Appendix 2, pp. 403–4.
- 30 Albertus, *In II Sent.*, 3.10 (Borgnet, xxvii), pp. 76–7; Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, 9. 1.9 (*Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72), ii), pp. 483–4, cit. R. Schenk, 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 184–7.
- 31 According to G.R. Evans, *Alan of Lille* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 158, twelfth-century theologians were the first medieval scholars to attempt a systematic, full-scale reconciliation of the biblical account of creation with an explanation of the beginning of the world based on natural causes as presented by natural philosophers.
- 32 Lombard, *Sentences*, ii, 3.4, p. 18; Alexander, *Glossa*, ii, 3, p. 39. Peter Lombard's analysis here implies Satan never stood 'in the truth' at all, with his fall linked to Adam's seduction, rather than to pride (see op.cit., 6.1, p. 24). However, earlier (op.cit., 3.4, pp. 14–7) he had stipulated a brief gap between Satan's creation and fall.
- 33 Variant arrangements of articles include the movement of articles four (empyrean heaven) and five (evil angel's creation) in some manuscripts to after articles seven (eternal truths), with their order occasionally reversed, and sometimes also after eight (time/creation). They thus sometimes separate articles seven and eight. This ordering is closer to that in Lateran IV, which could have prompted the move. Alternatively the differences could reflect increased concern over issues around eternal truths, God's omnipotence and Aristotelian views on time/creation, raising them up the order. Or, as apparently the case with the 1277 condemnation, the ordering was simply not fixed. However, while the sequence is different, the adherence to the angelic and creation theme remains: in particular, the progression from article seven to eight, albeit sometimes via four or five, survives, and so does that from article nine (natural gifts, grace and glory) to ten (Adam's fall). The only exception is Matthew Paris, who reverses the order of articles nine and ten. Thus the argument on angelic presence within articles eight and nine, where this is most hidden, is preserved.

Bibliography

Doi references may link to different editions to those cited in the bibliography.

Manuscript and archival sources

Bruxelles, Bibl. Roy., MS 1542.
Douai, MS 434.
Münster, Universitätsbibl., MS 257.
Oxford, Balliol, MS 62.
Paris, BN., Lat., MS 15652.
Paris, BN., Lat., MS 16406.
Troyes, MS 1862.
Vat., Lat., MS 691.
Vat., Lat., MS 782.

Printed primary sources

Albertus Magnus, *Opera omnia* ..., ed. E.C.A. Borgnet (38 vols., Paris, 1890–99).
Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1951–7).
Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae ‘antequam esset frater’*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1960).
Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent*, ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome, 2013).
Alexander of Hales, *Summa Theologica*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (4 vols., Florence, 1924–48).
Anselm of Canterbury, *The Major Works*, eds. B. Davies and G.R. Evans (Oxford, 2008).
Augustine, *De civitate Dei [Concerning the City of God against the Pagans]*, trans. H. Bettenson (London, revised 2003).
Augustine, *De Trinitate [The Trinity]*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 1991).
Augustine, *On Genesis*, trans. E. Hill (New York, 2002).
Augustine, *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Miscellany of Eighty-Three Questions; Miscellany of Questions in Response to Simplician; and, Eight Questions of Dulcitius*, trans. B. Ramsey (New York, 2008).
Bonaventure, *Opera omnia*, ed. A.C. Peltier (15 vols., Paris, 1864–72).

- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, eds. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (4 vols., Paris, 1889–97).
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., Washington, 1990).
- Guerric of St.-Quentin, *Quaestiones de quolibet*, ed. W.H. Principe, intr. J.-P. Torrell (Toronto, 2002).
- Hugh of St.-Cher, *In evangelia secundum Matthaeum, Lucam, Marcum, & Joannem, Opera omnia in universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (8 vols., Venice, 1703), vi.
- Hugh of St. Victor, *The Didascalicon*, trans. J. Taylor (New York, 1961).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano (4 vols., Toronto, 2007–10).
- Petrus Lombardus (Peter Lombard), *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (3 vols., Florence, 1971–81).
- Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid (New York, 1987).
- Richard Rufus, *In Physicam Aristotelis*, ed. R. Wood (Oxford, 2004).
- Robert Grosseteste, *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, eds. F.A.C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto, 2010).
- William of Auvergne, *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Paris, 1674).
- William of Auvergne, *The Providence of God Regarding the Universe*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 2007).
- William of Auvergne, *The Universe of Creatures*, trans. R.J. Teske (Milwaukee, 1998).

Printed secondary works

- Berlioz, J., ‘La voix de l’évêque. Guillaume d’Auvergne dans les *exempla* (XIII–XIV siècle)’, in *Autour de Guillaume d’Auvergne (+1249): Etudes réunies* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 11–33. <https://doi.org/10.1484/m.bhcma-cb.3.3099>
- Callebaut, A., ‘Le sermon historique d’Eudes de Châteauroux à Paris le 18 Mars 1229’, *AFH*, 28 (1935), pp. 81–114.
- Colish, M.L., ‘Early Scholastic Angelology’, in Colish (ed.), *Studies in Scholasticism* (Ashgate, 2006), pp. 80–109.
- de Contenson, P.-M., ‘La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle. *Le De retributionibus sanctorum* de Guillaume d’Auvergne et la condamnation de 1241’, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 46 (1962), pp. 409–44.
- Courtenay, W.J., ‘Dominicans and Suspect Opinion in the Thirteenth Century: The Cases of Stephen of Venizy, Peter of Tarentaise, and the Articles of 1270 and 1271’, *Vivarium*, 32:2 (1994), pp. 186–95.
- Davy, M.M., *Les sermons universitaires de 1230–1231: contribution à l’histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1931).
- Dondaine, H.-F., ‘L’objet et le medium de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIII^e siècle’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 19 (1952), pp. 60–130.
- Doucet, V., ‘La date des condamnations parisiennes dites de 1241. Faut-il corriger le cartulaire de l’université?’, in *Mélanges A. Pelzer: études d’histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale offertes à A. Pelzer à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Louvain, 1947), pp. 183–93.
- Evans, G.R., *Alan of Lille: The Frontiers of Theology in the Later Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Friedman, J., Hoff, J.C. and Chazan, R., *The Trial of the Talmud* (Toronto, 2012).
- Friedman, R.L., ‘Andreas de Novo Castro (fl. 1358) on Divine Omnipotence and the Nature of the Past: I *Sentences*, Distinction Forty-Five, Question Six’, *Cahiers de L’Institut du Moyen-Age Grec et Latin*, 64 (1994).

- Ginther, J.R., *The Westminster Handbook to Medieval Theology* (Louisville, Kentucky, 2009).
- Glorieux, P., 'Les années 1242–1247 à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 29 (1962), pp. 234–49.
- Glorieux, P., 'Les 572 questions du manuscrit de Douai 434', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 10 (1938), pp. 123–52, 225–67.
- Glorieux, P., *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIII^e siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1933–4).
- Guyot, B.-G., 'Quaestiones Guerrici, Alexandri et aliorum magistrorum Parisiensium (Praha. Univ. IV.D.13)', *AFP*, 32 (1962), pp. 5–125.
- Guyot, B.-G. and Dondaine, H.-F., 'Guerric de Saint-Quentin et la condamnation de 1241', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 44 (1960), pp. 225–42.
- Hansen, H., *John Pagus on Aristotle's Categories: A Study and Edition of the Rationes Super Praedicamenta Aristotelis* (Leuven, 2012).
- Keck, D., *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1998).
- Lambert, R.T., *Self knowledge in Thomas Aquinas: The Angelic Doctor on the Soul's Knowledge of Itself* (Bloomington, 2007).
- Lawrence, C.H., 'The Letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan School at Oxford', *JEH*, 42 (1991), pp. 218–38. doi:10.1017/s0022046900000063
- Macdonald, S., 'Grosseteste, Robert (c.1170–1253)', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/biographical/grosseteste-robert-c-1170-1253/v-1/sections/life-and-works-42192> (7 December 2017).
- Marrone, S.P., *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas of Truth in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, 1983).
- Muessig, C., 'Heaven, Earth and the Angels: Preaching Paradise in the Sermons of Jacques de Vitry', in C. Muessig and A. Putter (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), pp. 57–72.
- Noone, T.B., 'Roger Bacon and Richard Rufus on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: A Search for the Grounds of Disagreement', *Vivarium*, 35:2 (1997), pp. 251–65. doi:10.1163/1568534972662556
- Pasnau, R., *Theories of Cognition in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Power, A., *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Quay, P.M., 'Angels and Demons: The Teaching of IV Lateran', *Theological Studies*, 45 (1981), pp. 20–45. doi:10.1177/004056398104200102
- Schenk, R., 'Analogy as the *discrimen naturae et gratiae*: Thomism and Ecumenical Learning', in T.J. White (ed.), *The Analogy of Being: Invention of the Anti-Christ or Wisdom of God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2011), pp. 172–91.
- Schulman, N.M., 'Husband, Father, Bishop? Grosseteste in Paris', *Speculum*, 72 (1997), pp. 330–46. doi:10.2307/3040973
- Smalley, B., 'A Commentary on Isaías by Guerric of Saint-Quentin, O.P.', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (6 vols., Rome, 1946), ii (offprint).
- Smith, L., *The Ten Commandments: Interpreting the Bible in the Medieval World* (Leiden, 2014).
- Smith, L., 'William of Auvergne and the Jews: Papers Read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society', in D. Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 107–17.
- Southern, R., *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1992).
- Sweeney, L., *Divine Infinity in Greek and Medieval Thought* (New York, 1992).

- Sylla, E., *Review of Richard Rufus of Cornwall. In Physicam Aristotelis*, <https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/23840-richard-rufus-of-cornwall-in-physicam-aristotelis-auctores-britannici-medii-aevi-xvi/> (26 January 2016).
- Teske, R.J., 'William of Auvergne: An Overview', in *Teske, Studies in the Philosophy of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris (1228–1249)* (Milwaukee, 2006), pp. 17–28.
- Valois, N., *Guillaume d'Auvergne, évêque de Paris, 1228–1249, sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1880).
- Viller M., *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire* (17 vols., Paris, 1937–95), iv.
- Wood, R., 'Distinct Ideas and Perfect Solitude: Alexander of Hales, Richard Rufus, and Odo Rigaldus', *Franciscan Studies*, 53 (1993), pp. 7–31. doi:10.1353/frc.1993.0000
- Wood, R., 'The Earliest Known Surviving Western Medieval *Metaphysics* Commentary', *MPT*, 7 (1998), pp. 39–49. doi:10.1017/s1057060898071035
- Wood, R., 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall on Creation: The Reception of Aristotelian Physics in the West', *Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, 2 (1992), pp. 1–30. doi:10.5840/medievalpt199224
- Wood, R., 'Richard Rufus of Cornwall (d. after 1259)', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Dictionary of Philosophy*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/biographical/richard-rufus-of-cornwall-d-after-1259/v-1> (7 December 2017).
- Wood, R., 'Roger Bacon: Richard Rufus' Successor as a Parisian Physics Professor', *Vivarium*, 35 (1997), pp. 222–50. doi:10.1163/1568534972662565
- Young, S.E., *Scholarly Community at the Early University of Paris: Theologians, Education and Society, 1215–1248* (Cambridge, 2014).

Unpublished theses

- Charansonnet, A., 'L'université, l'Eglise et l'Etat dans les sermons du cardinal Eudes de Châteauroux (1190?–1273)' (Lyon University, PhD thesis, 2001).
- de Mayo, T.B., 'The Demonology of William of Auvergne' (University of Arizona, PhD thesis, 2006).
- Noone, T.B., 'An Edition and Study of the *Scriptum Super Metaphysicam* Book XII, d. 2: A Work Attributed to Richard Rufus of Cornwall' (University of Toronto, PhD thesis, 1987).

Website

- 'Quodlibase', <http://quodlibase.ehess.fr> (10 January 2014).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Index

- Abelard, Peter 2, 82, 103n76
 academic freedom 9–10
 academic heresy 3–5
 active intelligence *see* agent intellect
Ad Abolendam (Lucius III) 86
 Adam's fall 36–7, 143–7, 171–4, 176, 215–16, 246
Adversus Catharos (Moneta of Cremona) 85, 86, 115n181
Adversus haereses (Irenaeus) 174
 agent intellect (active intelligence, giver of forms) 21, 73, 76–7, 80, 108n119, 178
 Alan of Lille 8, 69, 89, 172, 174
 Albertus Magnus: angelic movement and location and 149–50, 243–4; Aristotle as compatible with Christianity and 186n116; article one and 133–4, 135; articles two and three and 137–40, 213–4; article four and 36, 140–1, 143; article five and 145–6, 243; article six and 149–50, 243–4; article seven and 153–4, 158–9, 244; article eight and 161, 163–6, 245; article nine and 175, 245; article ten and 145–6; biographical notes for 229–30; David of Dinant and 62–3, 165; empyrean heaven and 36, 140–1, 143; genesis of 1270 condemnation and 26; Gilbert of Poitiers and 64; God's knowledge and 158–9; grace, gifts and glory and 175, 245; infinity and 134; origin of evil and 145–6, 243; Platonic ideas and 152–4, 244; purgatory and 143; time and creation and 161, 163–6; Trinity and 137, 139–40, 213–14; use of as control text 7, 132
 Albigensians 54, 92; *see also* Cathars
 Alexander of Hales: angelic movement and location and 148–9, 150, 243; Aristotle as compatible with Christianity and 186n116; article one and 133, 134, 209–10; articles two and three and 137–9, 213–4; article four and 140–1; article five and 144–5, 215–6, 242; article six and 148–9, 243; article seven and 38–9, 151, 152, 154, 156–9, 220–1, 244; article eight and 160–1, 162–3, 222, 245; article ten and 144–5, 246; banned propositions in 22; biographical notes for 228; on cognition 42–3n6; empyrean heaven and 140–1; Franciscans and 50, 51; God's knowledge and 156–9, 220–1; on infinity 134; *Liber de causis* and 69; mathematical concepts and 151, 152, 160, 244; origin of evil and 144–5, 147, 215–16, 242; on *Periphyseon* 101n57; time and creation and 160–1, 162–3, 222, 245; Trinity and 137, 138–9, 213, 214; use of as control text 7, 132
 Amalricians 59, 62
 Amaury of Bène 5–6, 57, 58–9, 61–3, 185n108
 Ambrose 140, 148
 angels: angelic hierarchies 41–2, 170–1, 175–6, 220–1, 245–6; Avicenna and 72–3; beatific vision and 33, 59–60, 135, 210, 212, 241; case study on 238–47; in condemnation 57, 241, 246–7; creation and 161, 164, 198, 238–9, 240–1, 248; empyrean heaven and 35–6, 140–1, 239, 241–3; eternal truths and 150–4, 244; fall of Satan and other angels 37, 143–7, 215–6, 242–3, 246; gifts, grace and glory and 41–2, 170–6, 212, 223, 245–6; heretics and 87–9; as intelligences 72–3, 77–8, 239–40; Jews and 92;

- Maimonides and 77–8, 79; in Lateran IV 57, 241, 247; movement and location of 37–8, 77–8, 107n110, 148–50, 217–18, 243–4; nature of 238–9
- Anselm of Canterbury 39, 63, 84, 103n77, 113n159, 138, 151, 157, 242
- Anselm of Havelberg 84
- Anticlaudianus* (Alan of Lille) 172, 176
- Aphorismi de essentia summae bonitatis* 69
- Apparatus in Decretali Gregorii I* 59;
 see also Decretals (Pope Gregory IX)
- Aquinas 13n11, 42–3n6, 44n24, 62, 113n164, 118n209, 190n149, 223n1, 230
- Arianism, Arians, Arius 4, 29n26, 57, 62
- Aristotle: angelic movement and location and 148–9, 150; Averroes and 76–7; Avicenna and 71, 73; ban on works of 5–6, 53–4, 61–3, 66, 70–1, 77, 80, 110n143, 184n93, 198; Boethius and 63; as contemporary source 8, 67–9; David of Dinant and 62; empyrean heaven and 141; God's knowledge and 157, 158; Gregory IX and 53–4; heretics and 115n181; influence of 66–9; *Liber de causis* and 69, *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 75; Maimonides and 79; origin of evil and 145, 147; time and creation and 161–2, 164, 166–9; Trinity and 136, 140; William of Auxerre and 53
- Ars meliduna* 65, 155
- Ascension of Isaiah, The* 88–9
- Augustine: angels and 223, 238–9, 244, 245, 247, 248n7; beatific vision and 33, 57–8, 59–60, 75–6, 111–12n152, 133, 209, 211; dualism 58, 86, 115n180, 174–5, 247; empyrean heaven and 141; Eriugena and 57–8, 59–60; God's knowledge and 38–9, 154, 157, 220–1; grace, gifts and glory and 171–2, 173, 174–5, 188n131, 189nn140, 143, 223; ideas and 38, 151–2, 154, 157, 220–1; Jews and 119n223; *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 75–6; mathematical concepts and 38, 151–2, 244; origin of evil and 144, 244, 147, 242; Pelagius and 57, 174–5, 245; time and creation and 162, 167–9, 185n99, 186n118, 239, 245; Trinity and 35, 137–8, 180n20
- Averroes 8, 66–7, 71, 73, 76–7, 108n119, 149–50, 158, 165–9, 183n74, 228
- Avicenna 8, 53, 66–7, 70–5, 76–7, 106–8nn106, 112, 114, 115, 119, 134–7, 140, 149–50, 153, 156, 158, 162–4, 166–70, 183n74, 240, 244
- azyma* 82, 83
- Bacon, Roger 7, 20–1, 69, 80, 108n119, 178, 186n116, 218–19
- Baldwin, John 9
- beatific vision: angels and 241; Aristotle and 67–8; Augustine and 33, 57–8, 59–60, 75–6, 111–12n152, 133, 209, 211; description of article on 33–4; doctrinal influences on 133–6; Eriugena and 59–60; Greek theology and 81–2, 111–12nn150–2; *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 75–6; Maimonides and 78–9; problematic texts on 209–12
- Benedictines 52
- Bernard of Clairvaux 64, 103n73
- Bianchi, Luca 54
- Bible moralisée* 94
- Biller, Peter 86
- Blanche of Castille 51, 90
- Blemmydes, Nikephoros 83
- Boethius 8, 63, 64, 66, 75, 136, 137, 140, 144, 152, 157, 165, 169, 244
- Boethius of Dacia 26
- Bogomils 88–9, 92; *see also* Cathars
- Bonaventure 7, 69, 108n119, 175–6, 186n116, 245, 247–8n1
- Book of Knowledge* (Maimonides) 91
- Bullarium Franciscanum* 54
- Categories* (Aristotle) 63, 136, 140
- Cathars/Catharism 4, 47–8, 50, 85–90, 92–5, 142–3, 146–7, 150, 170, 174–5, 196, 242; *see also* Albigensians; Bogomils; dualism; heretics
- Celestine IV, Pope 46
- Chenu, Marie-Dominique 16n31, 62, 64
- Chronica majora* (Matthew Paris) 7, 29n24, 110n146
- Chrysostom, John 82, 84, 133, 134, 168–9, 190n146, 210
- Cicero 143, 186n113
- Cistercians 85
- Clement of Alexandria 174
- Collectio errorum in Anglia et Parisius condempnatorum* 7
- condemnation of 1241/4: annotated Latin text and English translation of 203–5; articles of 33–42; causes and influences

- for 46–96; date and number of times imposed 20–3; doctrinal influences for 56–80, 133–77; evaluation of influences for 132–79; individuals and faculties affected 25–6; institutional and intellectual context for 1–6; institutional influences for 48–56, 177–9; introduction to 1–12; manuscripts containing articles of 207–8; process for 23–5; sources for study of 6–10
- Constantinople, fall of 81
- corporeality 36–7, 79, 140–3, 239, 241
- Courtenay, William 7, 24–5
- creation: Amaury of Bène and 62; angels and 151–3, 244–5; Aristotle and 68; Avicenna and 73–5; ‘creatio-passio’ 40–1, 74, 75, 79, 160, 161, 163, 166, 169–70; description of article eight on 39–41; Eriugena and 60; evaluation of influences on article eight on 160–70; heretics and 88–9; Lateran IV and 57, 241; *Liber de causis* and 69; *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 75; *Liber de duobus principiis* and 88–9; Maimonides and 79; problematic texts on 221–2
- Crispin, Gilbert 103n76
- Dales, Richard 41
- Damascene, John 8, 82, 84, 107, 134, 138, 139, 140–1, 144–5, 148, 149, 179n4, 181nn30–1, 182–3n57, 188n133, 217–18, 243
- David of Dinant 5, 61–3, 165, 166, 183n71
- De anima* (Aristotle) 67, 76
- De anima* (Avicenna) 72
- De anima* (William of Auvergne) 134–5
- De animalibus* (Aristotle) 67
- De bono et malo* (William of Auvergne) 69
- De caelo* (Aristotle) 76–7, 239
- Decretals* (Pope Gregory IX) 4, 52, 55, 56, 96, 99nn32–3, 132, 199
- Decretum* (Gratian) 82, 97n11
- De divina praedestinatione* (Eriugena) 173
- De finitate motus et temporis* (Robert Grosseteste) 167
- De generatione et corruptione* (Aristotle) 67, 115n181, 162
- De ideis* (Richard Rufus) 157, 158, 219
- De legibus* (William of Auvergne) 93
- De libero arbitrio* (Augustine) 244
- De libero arbitrio* (Robert Grosseteste) 156
- De processione Spiritus Sancti* (Anselm of Canterbury) 113n159, 138
- De resurrectione* (Albertus Magnus) 140
- De retributionibus* (William of Auvergne) 135, 212
- De scientia divina* (Alexander of Hales) 157, 221
- De Spiritu sancto* (Ambrose) 148
- De Trinitate* (Augustine) 209
- De Trinitate* (Hilary of Poitiers) 148
- De Trinitate* (William of Auvergne) 65, 136, 167
- De universo* (William of Auvergne) 87, 93, 141–2, 146, 155, 167
- De veritate* (Robert Grosseteste) 156, 218
- Dominican General Chapter 7, 20, 30nn31–2, 98n20, 196
- Dominican Provincial Chapter of Provence 7
- Dominicans 25–7, 49, 50–1, 52, 53, 77, 81, 82, 85–6, 90–2, 94, 96, 98nn18, 20, 22–3, 103n74, 178, 196, 200, 211, 247
- Donin, Nicholas 53, 77, 90, 91
- Douai, MS 434 7–8, 41, 65, 132, 133, 134, 144, 148, 151, 160, 163, 176, 212, 214
- dualism/dualists 4, 85–90, 95, 146–7, 150, 174, 199, 238, 240–4, 246–7; *see also* Cathars
- dual procession 35, 57, 60, 63, 64, 83, 138–40, 214; *see also* filioque; Trinity/Trinitarian doctrine
- emanation theory (Neoplatonic) 73
- empyrean heaven 35–6, 57, 72, 83, 84, 140–3, 199, 215, 217, 239, 241–2, 246
- enuntiabilia *see* stateables
- Eriugena, John Scottus: Adam’s fall and 147; ban on works of 5–6, 24, 47, 100n54; as contemporary source 8; Greeks and 173; Latin reception of 100–1nn54, 57; *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 67, 75; link with Amaury of Bène 59, 61, 101–2n61; overview of influence and doctrines of 57–61; pantheism and 101nn59–60, 185n108; predestination and 173; pseudo-Dionysius and 81
- eternal truths that are not God: angels and 151–4; 244; Aristotle and 68; Eriugena and 60–1; evaluation of influences for 151–60; Jews and 93; Lateran IV and 57; *Liber de causis* and 70; *Liber de causis primis et secundis* and 75;

- Maimonides and 77; problematic texts on 218–21
 eternity of the world 21, 40–1, 66, 69, 73–4, 77, 79, 160–9, 198–9, 245;
see also infinity
 Eucharist 37, 43n18, 150
 Eugenius III, Pope 84
 evil/sin, origin of 11, 36–7, 57, 87–8, 143–7, 215–16, 241, 242–3, 246
 excommunication 3–4, 20, 22, 24–5, 46, 58, 61–2, 195, 197
- faculties, development of 2–3
 Ferruolo, Stephen 9
filioque controversy 35, 64, 82–3, 84, 196; *see also* dual procession; Trinity/Trinitarian doctrine
 First Cause/First (Prime) Mover 68–70, 73, 74, 76, 77, 157–8, 165–9, 219, 239–40;
see also Necessary Existent
 Fishacre, Richard 134
 Fourth Crusade 81
 Franciscans 25, 49, 50–1, 52, 81, 82, 84, 85, 90–2, 94, 98n23, 103n74, 110–11n146, 157–8, 178, 200, 209
 Frederick II 46, 47, 51, 53, 84, 195
- Gelasius, Pope 82
 Gerard of Cremona 66–7
 Gerard of Frachet 22
 Germanos II 83
 Gilbert of Poitiers 8, 29n26, 47, 57, 61–5, 136, 137–8, 140, 176, 188nn131–2
 giver of forms 73, 108n119; *see also* agent intellect
 Glorieux, Palémon 7–8
Glossa (Alexander of Hales): use as control text 7, 132; for use in commenting on topics in condemnation *see* Alexander of Hales
Glossa ordinaria 82, 162, 209
 Godfrey/Godefroid of Bléneau 38, 39, 151, 154, 156–7, 159, 229
 Godfrey of Fontaines 9
 grace, gifts and glory 41–2, 57, 68, 70, 170–6, 222–3, 245–6
 Gratian 82, 97n11
 Greek Church 8, 35, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 81–5, 94–5, 112–13n157, 138–40, 175
 Gregory IX, Pope: Aristotle and 53–4, 80; *Decretals* by 4, 52, 55, 56, 96, 99nn32–3, 132, 199; Dominicans/Franciscans and 50, 52, 54; Frederick II and 46, 47, 51, 53, 84, 195; Greeks and 83–4; Jews and 90, 94; Michael Scot and 53, 66; papal involvement and 51–6; papal leadership and 46; support of university by 2, 51, 55–6; *see also* *Parens scientiarum* (Gregory)
 Gregory Nazianzen 99–100n37, 112n154, 139
 Gregory of Nyssa 75
 Grosseteste, Robert 13n11, 21, 76, 156, 160, 167–8, 184n93, 185n107, 186nn115–16, 218–19, 228, 230–1
 Gueric of St.-Quentin: angelic movement and location and 150, 217–18, 243–4; banned propositions in 22; beatific vision and 133, 210–11; biographical notes for 228–9; as contemporary source 7; Franciscans and 200n2; Gilbert of Poitiers and 65; grace, gifts and glory and 222–3, 245; purgatory and 142–3; Sabellius and 138; Trinity and 138, 213–15; on virginity 196
Guide for the Perplexed (Maimonides) 66, 71, 77–80, 91–2, 94, 147, 153, 165
- Hasselhoff, Görg 77
 Helinand of Froidmont 64
 Henry Hostiensis, Cardinal 59, 61
 Heresy/heretics: Greeks and 83–4; Gregory IX and 53; Jews and 92–5; problematic teaching and 3–5; *see also* Albigensians; Bogomils; Cathars; dualism
Hexaameron (Robert Grosseteste) 167
 Hilary of Poitiers 148
 Honorius III, Pope 5–6, 46, 53, 58, 85, 86
 Honorius Augustodunensis 173
 Hugh of St.-Cher 7, 46, 133, 210, 229
 Hugo Etherianus 84–5
- Incoherence of the Incoherence* (Averroes) 77
 individuation of human soul 21, 72–3, 107–8nn114–15, 134
Inevitable (Honorius Augustodunensis) 173
 infinity 21, 60, 67, 68, 76, 107–8n115, 133–4, 167, 179n6, 186nn113, 115, 211;
see also eternity
 Innocent III, Pope 3, 46, 47–8, 49, 61, 83
 Innocent IV, Pope 23, 46, 91, 94, 195, 227, 229
 inquisition 4, 8, 50–1, 53, 81, 84, 86, 95
 intelligence, *Liber de causis* and 69–70
In Titum (Jerome) 161

- Irenaeus 174
 Isidore of Seville 133, 144, 162, 238–9, 245
 Ivo of Narbonne 86–7
- Jacob ben Reuben 92
 Jerome 133, 161, 174–5, 245
 Jews 13n11, 47, 52–3, 77, 79, 81, 90–5, 99n33, 110n142, 118n210, 119n223, 147, 152–3, 240, 243–4, 247
 Joachim of Fiore 5, 57, 61–3, 64, 65, 96–7n5, 99n32, 101–2n61, 118n215, 180n25, 235–7
 John Chrysostom *see* Chrysostom, John
 John Damascene *see* Damascene, John
 John of Brescain 23, 25, 29n26, 30n30, 227–8
 John of La Rochelle 97n13, 224n8, 228
 John of Luigo 89
 John of Salisbury 65, 104n84, 112n152
 John of St. Albans 98n22
 John III Vatatzes, Emperor 83
 John of Wildeshausen 30n31, 196, 200–1n4
 John Pagus 22–3, 25, 28n12, 177, 214, 215, 230
- knowledge, God's 38–9, 68, 70, 71–2, 76, 77, 156–9, 219–21
 knowledge, human's *see* beatific vision
- Langton, Stephen 53, 64–5
 Lateran IV: adherence to 6, 11–12, 48; angels in 238–47; articles' and condemnation's link to 11–12, 25–6, 57, 178, 198–9; condemnations in 5, 61–5; description of 3, 56–7; as influence 47–8, 56–7; statement of faith in 198–9; text and translation of 232–7
libellum sive tractatum ... de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis (Joachim of Fiore) 62, 234–5
Liber de causis 66–7, 69–70, 75, 133–4, 135, 152–3, 167, 239, 240, 244, 247
Liber de causis primis et secundis 67, 75–6
Liber de duobus principiis 87–9, 116nn185–6, 240, 242
Liber de vera philosophia 102n69
Long Commentary on the Metaphysics (Averroes) 77, 108n119
 Lossky, Vladimir 34
 Louis IX 51–2, 90–1, 94, 195, 227–8
 Lucius III, Pope 86
- Magisterium divine et sapientiale* (William of Auvergne) 9, 227
 Maimonides 8, 13n11, 66, 71, 77–80, 91–2, 94, 109n136, 117n204, 118n209, 145, 147, 149–50, 153, 162, 165–6, 180–1n26, 239, 240, 243, 247; *see also* *Guide for the Perplexed*
 Mani 58
 Manichaeans/Manichees 4, 58, 86–7, 146–7, 174, 189n143, 242; *see also* Cathars
 Manuel I Comnenos, Emperor 84
 mathematical concepts 38, 151–4, 160, 244; *see also* eternal truths that are not God
 Matthew Paris 7, 20, 25, 26–7, 36, 86–7
 Mauricius Hispanus/Mauricius of Spain 5, 62
 Maximus the Confessor 59, 173
Metaphysics (Aristotle) 5, 54, 62, 66, 67, 69, 76–7, 147, 153, 157, 162, 168, 172–3
Metaphysics, commentary on (Richard Rufus) 156, 168–9, 218–20, 222
Metaphysics, commentary on (Averroes) 76, 77
Metaphysics [of Healing] (Avicenna) 71, 75, 156
Milhamot Hashem (The Wars of the Lord), Jacob ben Reuben) 92, 184n93
 Moneta of Cremona 85, 86, 89
- Nahmanides 92
 Necessary Existent 71, 73–4; *see also* First Cause/First (Prime) Mover
 Neoplatonism 8, 10, 59, 61–3, 66–7, 69–70, 71, 73, 75, 77, 80, 95, 111n149, 133–4, 145–6, 150, 151–2, 157, 173, 197, 198, 239, 243–5, 247
 Nequam, Alexander 65
Nicomachean Ethics (Aristotle) 145, 168, 188n133
 nominalists 65, 155
- Odo (Eudes) of Châteauroux 1, 23–5, 46, 49, 58–9, 90–1, 93, 96, 178, 199, 227
 Odo (Eudes) Rigaud 7, 21–2, 134, 158
 omnipotence of God *see* angelic movement and location
On Ezekiel (Origen) 175
Opuscula sacra (Gilbert of Poitiers) 63, 64
 Origen 82, 144, 174, 175, 189–90n145, 238

- pantheism 58, 62, 164, 166, 220
 papal involvement in university at Paris 51–5
Parens scientiarum (Gregory) 2, 6, 10, 24, 51–2, 53–4, 66, 76, 96
 Pelagius 57, 174–5, 189n140, 245
Periphyseon (Eriugena) 5–6, 24, 47, 58–61, 75, 80, 100–2nn54, 57, 60–1, 173, 188n131
 perpetuity 41, 160, 162, 164, 167, 187n113
 Peter Lombard: Adam's fall 144, 146, 246, 242; angelic hierarchies and 170–1; angelic movement and location and 148, 150, 243; angels' fall and 144, 146, 197, 242; article one and 133–4; articles two and three and 137–8, 139–40; article four and 140; article five and 144, 146, 197, 242; article six and 37, 148, 150, 243; article seven and 39, 152, 157, 159, 244; article eight and 161–2, 169, 223n1, 245; article nine and 170–2, 175, 245; article ten and 144, 146, 246; 'creatio-passio' and 169; dualism and 86, 247; empyrean heaven and 140; eternal truths that are not God and 152, 157, 159, 244; Gilbert of Poitiers and 63, 137; God's knowledge and 39, 157; grace, gifts and glory and 170–2, 175, 245; infinity and 133; influence of on use of patristic authorities 82; Joachim of Fiore and 5, 57, 62, 234–6; Lateran IV and 5, 57, 62, 234–6; mathematical concepts and 152; origin of evil and 144, 146, 242; time and creation and 160–2, 169, 245; Trinity and 5, 57, 62, 63, 137–8, 139–40; use of as control text 7, 132
 Peter of Poitiers 49, 65
 Peter the Chanter 48–9, 197
 Peter the Venerable 117n201
 Philip the Chancellor 24, 49, 69, 76, 141, 154, 170, 171, 172–3, 230
 philosophy, impact of 65–80
 Photius 113n159, 114n170
Physics (Aristotle) 54, 62, 67, 68, 77, 141, 147, 149, 150, 162, 164, 168, 169, 198, 239
Physics (Avicenna) 74
Physics, commentary on (Richard Rufus) 221–2
 Pierre de Bar 160
 Plato: Albertus Magnus on Plato's three principles 152–3, 161–2; angels and 151–4, 244; availability of dialogues of 8, 66, 105n90, 188n134; David of Dinant and 63; Maimonides on creation and 77, 79; God's knowledge and 157, 244; ideas/forms/eternal truths and 38, 60, 73, 77, 79, 151–7, 159–60, 244; infinity and 133; mathematical concepts and 152; Philip the Chancellor on 154; purgatory and 143; second gods and 73; as source 8; time and creation and 161–2, 164, 165, 185n107, 186n118; vision of God and 134; *see also Timaeus* (Plato)
 Plotinus 106n100, 157
Posterior Analytics (Aristotle) 67, 68, 136, 168, 231
Postquam Graecorum (Gregory IX) 83–4
 Praepositinus of Cremona 24, 49, 86, 136
 predestination and freewill 41–2, 57, 170–6
 Premonstratensians 52
 Prime Cause/Mover 75–6, 78, 153;
 see also First Cause, First Mover
 primum nunc (tempus nunc/first moment of time) 39–41, 68, 74, 160–70, 198–9, 221–2
 Proclus 67
Psalterium decem chordarum (Joachim of Fiore) 62
 pseudo-Dionysius 8, 41–2, 75, 81, 111n149, 133, 135, 139, 157, 170, 173, 217, 231, 245
 purgatory 82, 83, 142–3

Quaestio About the eternal truth of things (De veritate eterna rerum) (Alexander of Hales) 38–9, 244
Quaestio De duratione mundi (Alexander of Hales) 162–3
Quaestiones (Guerric of St.-Quentin) 210–11
Quaestiones de quolibet (Guerric of St.-Quentin) 65, 142–3, 210–11, 213, 215, 217–18, 222–3, 243–5
Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'/pre-Franciscan *Quaestiones* (Alexander of Hales) 139, 209, 213, 214, 228
Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent (Alexander of Hales) 220, 222, 244–5, 228; *see also Quaestio De duratione mundi; Quaestio About the eternal truth of things*
Quateruli (David of Dinant) 61

- Rainerius Sacconi 89–90
 Raymond, master 23, 227–8
 Raymond of Peñafort 30n31, 50–1, 199
 realists 65, 155
 Rigaud, Odo 7, 21, 134, 158
 Robert of Courçon/Courson 5–6, 48, 62
 Robert of Melun 65
 Roland of Cremona 50, 69, 86, 229
 Rufus, Richard 40, 76, 105n86, 156–8,
 168–70, 187n123, 209, 218–22,
 225n37, 228

 Sabellians/Sabellius 57, 62, 138
Sacrorum Conciliorum 54–5
 Samuel ben Abraham 92
 Satan's fall 36–7, 57, 79, 87–8, 143–7,
 197, 215–16, 242–3, 246
 Scot, Michael 53, 66, 71
Sententiae commentary (Richard Rufus)
 219–20
Sententiae/Sentences (Peter Lombard):
 use as control text 7, 132; for use in
 commenting on topics in condemnation
 see Peter Lombard
Sententiae/Sentences commentary
 (Albertus Magnus): use as control text 7,
 132; for use in commenting on topics in
 condemnation see Albertus Magnus
Sic et non (Abelard) 82
 Siger of Brabant 26
 Solomon ben Abraham, Rabbi 91–2
Somnium Scipionis (Cicero) 143
 Spence, Richard 84
 Stateables (enuntiabilia) 38, 39, 65, 154–7,
 104n84, 159, 177, 218–19
 Stephen of Venizy 22, 25, 28–9n22, 229
 strike of 1229–1231 2, 24, 51, 96, 195,
 227, 229, 230
Summa against Manichaeian heretics 90
Summa aurea (William of Auxerre) 69, 86,
 115n181
Summa contra haereticos 86
Summa de bono (Philip the Chancellor) 69,
 141, 154
*Summa Fratris Alexandri/ Summa
 theologica* (Alexander of Hales) 69,
 101n57, 109n136, 134, 215–16, 228
Summa Theologica (Aquinas) 13n11,
 43n18, 44n24, 113n164, 190n149

 Talmud 8, 14n18, 22, 47, 53, 77, 79,
 81, 90–4, 116–17nn199–201, 204,
 147, 178, 196, 199, 200, 227, 229,
 230, 240
 Tempier, Stephen 26
 tempus nunc see primum nunc
Theological Tractates (Boethius)
 103n75, 140
 threats from outside Latin Church 81–95
Timaeus (Plato) 66, 73, 105n90, 152, 153,
 157, 159, 186n118
 time, first moment of see primum nunc
 Titus of Bostria 174
Treatise on Divine Knowledge
 (Averroes) 77
Treatise on the Trinity (attr. Gilbert of
 Poitiers) 64
 Trinity/Trinitarian doctrine 5, 34–5, 39,
 49, 57, 60, 62–4, 79–80, 83, 89, 93,
 102–4nn69, 70, 73–7, 79, 136–40,
 159–60, 213–15, 241; see also dual
 procession; *filioque*
 twelfth-century debates 65, 155

 Valentinus 174, 189n141
Verbum abbreviatum (Peter the
 Chanter) 49
 Victorines 52
 Vincent of Beauvais 64
 Virgin Mary 35, 90, 142
 vision: theory of 67, 73, 135; through a
 mirror 73, 135, 209–10, 212; see also
 beatific vision
Vision of Isaiah, The 88–9
Vitae fratrum (Gerard of Frachet) 22

 Wei, Ian 9
 William of Auvergne: agent intellect and
 21, 80; Aristotle and 68, 166, 186n113;
 Averroes and 76; Avicenna and 71,
 107n114, 136–7, 166, 169; Bacon on
 178; beatific vision and 68, 134–5,
 212; biographical notes for 227–8;
 Cathars and 87; context for and date
 of condemnation and 1, 23, 24–5, 80;
 corporeality and 36, 141, 143; 'creatio-
 passio' and 169; dualism/dualists and
 4, 146, 243; edited text of 9; empyrean
 heaven and 36, 141–2; eternal truths
 that are not God and 218–19; Gilbert
 of Poitiers and 65; God's knowledge
 and 68; grace, gifts and glory and
 188n131; Gregory IX and 51; Jews
 and 90–1, 93; John of Brescain and 23;

- Lateran IV and 65; *Liber de causis* and 69; Maimonides and 109n136; Muslims and 110n145, 182n42; ordination of 51; origin of evil and 146–7; philosophy and 105n86; preaching/external focus and 177, 178; Plato and 179–80n12; as source 7; stateables/enuntiabilia and 65, 154–6, 159; time and creation and 166–7, 169, 186n113; Trinity and 136–7
- William of Auxerre 53, 69, 86
- William of Durham 160
- Young, Spencer 9